

University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, &
Professional Papers

Graduate School

1968

Treatment of prisoners of war in England during the English Civil Wars, 22 August, 1642 - 30 January, 1648/49

Gary Tristram Cummins
The University of Montana

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd>

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Cummins, Gary Tristram, "Treatment of prisoners of war in England during the English Civil Wars, 22 August, 1642 - 30 January, 1648/49" (1968). *Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers*. 3948.

<https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd/3948>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

127
TREATMENT OF PRISONERS OF WAR IN ENGLAND

DURING THE ENGLISH CIVIL WARS

22 AUGUST 1642 - 30 JANUARY 1648/49

by

GARY TRISTRAM CUMMINS

B.A. University of Montana, 1964

Presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of


Master of Arts

University of Montana

1968

Approved:


Chairman, Board of Examiners


Dean, Graduate School

December 12, 1968
Date

UMI Number: EP34264

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent on the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP34264

Copyright 2012 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This edition of the work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	11
CHAPTER	PAGE
I. CAPTURE.....	1
II. AFTER CAPTURE.....	17
III. RELEASE FROM INPRISONMENT.....	32
IV. THE ROYAL PRISONER.....	41
V. CONCLUSIONS.....	63
APPENDICES	
A. ARTICLES OF SURRENDER FOR BRISTOL, 8 SEPTEMBER 1645.....	70
B. ARTICLES OF SURRENDER, LORD RALPH HOPTON TO SIR THOMAS FAIRFAX, TRURO, 14 MARCH 1645.....	73
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	79

INTRODUCTION

On 22 August 1642 King Charles I of England formalized the beginning of the military phase of his long feud with Parliament by unfurling the Royal Standard in a field near Nottingham. As he carried out this symbolic act, supporters of his cause and of Parliament's throughout England hurried to prepare for war. The English Civil Wars, which were to last for six years, constitute a vital period in English history. The ramifications of the conflict and the political ideals that found expression during it are evident today wherever a parliamentary democracy exists. Because of its importance, the English Civil War period has been well covered by historians. Leopold von Ranke, Gardiner, Firth, Trevelyan and Wedgwood, to mention a few, dealt extensively with Revolutionary England. Despite the volume and quality of scholarship attracted to this period, many questions remain unanswered. One such question is that of the treatment of prisoners of war taken during the Civil Wars.

Contemporary accounts of the English Civil Wars contain numerous references to prisoners of war. These references, however, have never been gathered into a study concerning that subject. The treatment of prisoners of war (during the English Civil Wars) is a narrow topic for an extensive study, but a valuable one. It is an original contribution to the historical knowledge of the period, and furthermore, offers an insight into the organizational structures of both armies and into the degree of severity of the wars.

For the above reasons, I have chosen as the topic for this paper, Treatment of Prisoners of War in England, 22 August 1642 - 30 January 1648/49. The paper is concerned only with the treatment of actual

military prisoners captured in engagements in England. Those taken in Scotland and Ireland are not included for reasons of brevity and due to the different character of the fighting in those areas. The study is analytical, that is, what happened to the prisoners, the circumstances, and why it happened. The organization is by topic rather in chronological order for the sake of clarity and to facilitate comparison of the Cavalier and Roundhead systems. The first chapter deals with the capture of prisoners, the second with their treatment, the third with their release, the fourth with the captivity of King Charles and the fifth contains the paper's conclusions. It was felt that Charles' captivity merited a separate chapter for two reasons: his unique position as the King and leader of the Royalist cause, and his unique conduct as a prisoner of war, which was to lead to the Second Civil War and his subsequent execution. In each chapter the criteria for each topic are set out, followed by exceptions to those criteria. The two sides' policies are then compared.

CHAPTER I

CAPTURE

At first glance, the capture of enemy soldiers would seem a relatively simple act. During the English Civil Wars, a capture was usually effected by no more than forcing the enemy to lay down his weapons and place himself under the control of his captor. However, captures could be quite complicated, especially when large numbers of prisoners were involved. These captures often meant long and tedious negotiations with frequent parties. Both parties were bound by the rigid but unwritten Baroque code of chivalry.

Throughout the English Civil Wars both sides took prisoners by two general methods: conditional and unconditional capture. The granting of quarter,¹ negotiated surrender, and articles of surrender are examples of conditional capture. When prisoners were forcibly carried away, either on the field of battle or in a successful siege, they became victims of unconditional capture.

A soldier who wished to be granted quarter usually did so when he saw that victory and escape were equally impossible. He would then throw down his arms and "cry out for quarter." Theoretically, he then became a prisoner and did not sustain any major harm to his person. Personal belongings were seldom guaranteed by quarter

¹The word quarter meant mercy and a soldier granted quarter was literally granted his life by his captor. Usually the defeated side asked for quarter, but in many cases the victors granted it unasked to particularly gallant foes.

unless specifically agreed to before the actual capture.¹ At the battle of Naseby, 14 July 1645, Fairfax's Roundhead cavalry surrounded the retreating Cavalier infantry and artillery train. The Cavaliers then, "threw down their Armes, crying for Quarter, and all were taken Prisoners."² When the Duke of Buckingham became trapped in an inn by Parliamentary troops, he yielded to his captors with the following speech:

Gentlemen and souldiers, I am a gentleman and desire you that I may be used as a gentleman. I pray you let me have quarter for my life; I am your prisoner and desire that I may be civilly used, and that you will show yourselves souldiers and gentlemen towards me. I offer you no opposition, but freely surrender myself your prisoner.³

Although this was the approximate manner in which the request and granting of quarter was carried out in most cases, there were many exceptions. Sometimes the victors refused requests for quarter. This often happened when the fighting was unusually intense and the winning soldiers became carried away with the excitement of a victory. At Edgehill, 23 October 1642, the Parliamentary horse ignored the pleas for quarter from the Royalist artillerymen and killed many of them as they hid beneath their guns.⁴ Many of the Scots killed by

¹Charles H. Firth, Cromwell's Army, (London: Methuen and Co., 1962), pp. 191, 407.

²Thomas May, "A breviary of the History of the Parliament of England," Select Tracts Relating to the Civil Wars in England in the First Reign of King Charles the First: By Writers Who Lived in the Time of Those Wars, and Were Witnesses of the Events Which They Describe, Francis Maseres (ed.), (London: R. Wilks, 1815), ii, 77.

³Alfred Kingston, East Anglia and the Great Civil War (London: Elliot Stock, 1897), p. 276.

⁴Alfred H. Burne and Peter Young, The Great Civil War (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1959), p. 28.

the Parliamentary soldiers at Preston on 17 August 1648 fell victims to this battle hysteria.¹ Incidents of this nature, occurring throughout both Civil Wars, proved to be the exception rather than the rule. Also, the number of such incidents did not increase appreciably as the wars went on, thus not reflecting a trend of increasing brutality.

Occasionally, cruelty caused men of either side to refuse quarter to their enemies. The day after the battle of Edgehill, a detachment of Royalist horse under Prince Rupert entered the village of Keinton and killed several helpless Parliamentary soldiers, including some wounded.² On 22 February 1642/43, fifteen hundred of Rupert's Cavaliers surprised a small band of Parliamentary troops in the village of Alton. The outnumbered Roundheads asked for quarter, and were "scornfully refused."³ At Burton-on-Trent, in 1643, a unit of the Queen's army drove a number of Parliamentarians into a church and refused their request for quarter. After the refusal, the Royalists forced their way into the church and, "outt all their throats."⁴

A particularly brutal example of the refusal to grant quarter occurred in June, 1648 when a group of Parliamentary horse from

¹Edward, Lord Clarendon, History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars and England (Oxford: University Press, 1849), IV, 407.

²Charles H. Firth (ed.), The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow Lieutenant-General of Horse in the Army of the Commonwealth 1652-1672 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894), I, 46.

³G. N. Godwin, The Civil War in Hampshire. 1642-1645 and the Story of Basing House (Southampton: Henry March and Son, 1904), p. 71.

⁴Luke, Samuel, The Journal of Sir Samuel Luke (Oxford: Oxfordshire Record Society, Banbury, Cheney and Sons, 1950), II, 117.

Crowland attacked a detachment of Cavaliers and drove them into Woodcroft House, near Stamford. The colonel in command of the Parliamentarians granted quarter to all the trapped Royalists with the exception of Michael Hudson, a chaplain with the Royalist army who had formerly served King Charles. When the Roundheads pursued Hudson to the roof of the house, he attempted to escape by hanging from the eaves and dropping into the moat, whereupon one of his assailants chopped off his hands, causing him to fall into the moat. Hudson's assailant ran down to him, "where they found him paddling with his stumps, and barbarously knocked him on the head."¹

From the beginning of the First Civil War, the Parliamentary soldiers singled out captured Irish Royalists for harsh treatment. Many, if not most, of the Parliamentarians regarded the Irish as sub-human creatures who would like nothing better than to butcher English Protestants in the name of the Pope of Rome. This view received a good deal of credence in 1641, when the Irish revolted and massacred many Protestant settlers in Ulster and elsewhere, while committing other appropriate atrocities. The story lost nothing in the telling between Dublin and London, and the number of killed grew into the thousands while the atrocities reported were of the most hideous variety.²

After the outbreak of hostilities in England, there was a constant fear among the supporters of Parliament that an army of

¹Kingston, East Anglia, p. 264.

²Clarendon, History of the Rebellion, V, 210-245.

Catholic Irish would land in England in support of King Charles. In 1643 and after, when Charles' negotiations with the Irish rebels became known, this fear became something of a hysteria. Rumors of Irish troops landing at various places in England circulated freely and appeared in the pro-Parliament press.¹ Parliament's soldiers, believing these rumors and half truths, refused to grant quarter to Irish or suspected Irish Royalists. At Cheriton, on 29 March 1644, a Parliamentary regiment of Kentishmen refused quarter to a group of Irish and killed many of them.² In May of the same year, Parliamentarians allowed several Irish soldiers taken at sea to drown.³ Other Irish were put to death in July, 1644 at Weymouth⁴ and Dorchester.⁵ The latter incident prompted the Royalist Prince Maurice to hang a parliamentary sea-captain in reprisal.⁶

On 23 October 1644, the House of Commons decided to give legal sanction to the killing of Irishmen who attempted to surrender. The House ordered four of its members to draw up an ordinance which,

¹A Perfect Diurnal, (London), 1, 5 April, 1644.

²Godwin, Hampshire, pp. 183-185.

³Allen B. Hynds (ed.), Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts Relating to English Affairs. Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice and in other Libraries of Northern Italy (London: His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1925), XXVII, 101.

⁴Walter Bouchier Devereux, Lives and Letters of the Devereux, Earls of Essex 1540-1646, (London: John Murray, 1853), I, 418.

⁵A. R. Bayley, The Great Civil War in Dorset (Taunton: Barnicott and Pearce, Essex Press, 1910), p. 204.

⁶C. V. Wedgwood, The King's War (New York: Macmillan Co., 1959), p. 353.

in effect, denied quarter to Irish rebels taken in England.¹ The ordinance, read in the House of Commons the next day, stated that, "no Rebel of Ireland, taken in Armes by Sea or Land, shall have quarter."² In short order both Houses approved the measure, entered it in the Journals of their respective Houses, and sent copies to the commanders of the parliamentary forces.³ As entered and sent, however, it contained two important changes. Rather than "Rebel of Ireland," the ordinance included all Irish and "Papists born in Ireland," as being prohibited from quarter. It is also stipulated that any commanders negligent in observing the tenor of the ordinance would be branded as supporters of the Irish rebellion and as such, liable for punishment.⁴

A number of Irish in the service of the King paid the supreme price as a result of this ordinance. At Shrewsbury, Falmouth,⁵ and Padstow Harbour,⁶ Irish-born Cavaliers died while trying to surrender. In 1648, Parliamentary soldiers put to the sword a number of Walloons

¹Great Britain, Journals of the Houses of Commons (New York: Readex Microprint Co.), III, 673. The four members were: Mr. Reynolds, Sir John Clotworthy, Mr. Corbett and Mr. Holles.

²Ibid., III, 675.

³Ibid., III, 676.

⁴Commons Journals, III, 676. It is not known how the change was made, or by whom.

⁵Bulstrode Whitelooke, Memorials of the English Affairs, or, an Historical Account of what passed from the beginning of the Reign of Charles the First, to Charles the Second His Happy Restauration (London: Nathaniel Ponder, 1682), pp. 77, 204.

⁶Wedgwood, King's War, p. 540.

they mistook for Irish at Scarborough Castle.¹ However, the ordinance was not completely observed, as some Irish captives were still taken and imprisoned with their English comrades-in-arms.²

Two well-documented cases of negotiated surrender in the field during the Civil Wars have survived the test of time: the surrender of the Earl of Essex's army to King Charles at Fowey, 1 September 1644,³ and the surrender of Lord Hopton's army to Sir Thomas Fairfax at Truro, 14 March 1645/46.⁴ In both instances the victorious sides did not retain the prisoners.

In late August, 1644, Royalist forces under Prince Maurice with King Charles in attendance, trapped the Earle of Essex and his army at Fowey on the Cornwall peninsula. When Parliament proved unable to provide relief in time, General Essex escaped by boat on 21 August while his cavalry cut its way through the enemy lines. He left his infantry under Phillip Skippon's command, to its fate. On 1 September, Skippon reluctantly asked Maurice for negotiations on terms of surrender.⁵

¹Whitelocke, Memorials, p. 332.

²Commons Journals, IV, 210. An order that stated that the Irish rebels among the prisoners taken at Naseby by Fairfax, "be committed to safe custody, and sent to Newgate."

³John Rushworth, Historical Collections of Private Passages of State (London: Chitwell and Cockerill, 1701), V, 705-706.

⁴Ibid., I, 105-106.

⁵Rushworth, Collections, V, 705-706. These terms were usually a feature of siege warfare and were called "articles of surrender." They were generally long and detailed, and arrived at only after lengthy negotiation.

The Roundheads received remarkably generous surrender terms. All of the Parliamentary officers and men were to be convoyed in safety by Royalist cavalry to the Parliamentary garrison at Lostithiel. None were to be encouraged to join the Royalists, but volunteers would be welcomed. The officers retained their horses, weapons, servants and baggage. They yielded all other weapons, including the artillery train, to the victors.¹ Their adversaries faithfully adhered to these articles. When Skippon reported to the King that some of his men were being plundered by Royalist soldiers, Charles personally intervened and stopped it.²

Very likely the Royalists in this case wanted to avoid the difficulties in guarding, transporting, feeding and housing the large number of prisoners. To do so would have involved a great expenditure of time and men, neither of which an army on the move can spare. Had the surrender taken place closer to a strong Cavalier garrison, such as Oxford, the entire Parliamentary force probably would have been imprisoned.

In early March, 1645/46, Sir Thomas Fairfax's forces surrounded the army of Lord Hopton at Truro, in Cornwall. The latter, finding himself threatened as much by mutiny as by Fairfax, agreed on 9 March to negotiate a surrender.³ The talks proved lengthy and the bargaining over minor details was intensive. The two sides did

¹Ibid.

²Wedgwood, King's War, pp. 360-361.

³Rushworth, Collections, VI, 108.

not reach agreement until 14 March. The terms, though harsher than those the Royalists had earlier granted Skippon, were still liberal. Hopton's army was disbanded and the officers and men were free to leave the country or remain in England on parole. The officers and gentlemen were allowed to retain a specified number of horses, servants, weapons and baggage, according to rank. The common soldiers were allowed to keep their horses or twenty shillings in lieu of them. The articles prohibited plundering of any of the defeated party.¹ Through these measures Fairfax probably hoped to avoid the problems arising from keeping a great number of prisoners. At the same time he hoped to create good will among the inhabitants of Cornwall, many of whom were members of Hopton's army. He had used the same policy earlier at Torrington.²

When the first Civil War broke out, both sides established numerous strongholds in mansions, castles, and towns throughout England. Strategically, each of these strongholds was a center for the military activities of the side occupying them. Weapons and supplies were stored in them, and garrisons of troops conducted offensive operations out of them. Units from the smaller fortified locations were able to harass the enemy with raids, while troops from the larger garrisons in the cities often controlled widespread areas. Economically, possession of these strongholds enabled the garrisons to collect foodstuffs and tax monies from the surrounding

¹See Appendix B.

²Rushworth, Collections, IV, 98, and Whitelocke, Memorials, p. 200.

populace. The fortified cities, such as London and Gloucester, were valuable tax sources themselves. Also, many of the strongholds occupied positions that allowed the possessor to control commercial activities in the area. Coastal strongpoints such as Hull, Newcastle and Gloucester, and fortified centers along the inland trade routes, such as Basing House and York, fit into this category.

Capture of all the enemy's strongholds was necessary before a victory could be claimed. Consequently, because of the large number of fortified locations held by both sides, siege warfare predominated during the Civil Wars. Most of the prisoners taken during both wars were captured in sieges.

Sieges were successful in two ways: capitulation on articles of surrender, or capitulation by an overwhelming attack. The commander of the besieging force usually offered articles of surrender to the defenders at the onset of a siege. Usually, the articles first offered were quite good, in hopes of obtaining a quick surrender. The personal honor of the commander of the garrison as well as that of his officers was seldom neglected. The safety of his men was also provided for. Generally, these first articles offered called upon the garrison to yield the stronghold in return for being allowed to march to another area, escorted by the attackers, then set free.

In most cases, the garrison commander rejected the first articles even if resistance was hopeless. It was considered a blot on his honor to give in so readily and it might also arouse suspicion of treachery. The siege then went on until the besiegers gave up,

the stronghold was overrun, or, as in most cases, the garrison commander called for negotiations. In the event of negotiations, both sides presented what they thought were reasonable conditions, then settled down to haggle over the details. This process often took days. If a deadlock occurred, the negotiations were broken off and the siege resumed until another parley was called. When conditions were agreed upon, they were almost always scrupulously observed by both sides. Almost without exception they were generous to the defeated side. The exceptions to these generalizations are covered later.

One of the best examples of a siege in this period, namely that of Bristol, took place in the late summer of 1645. Prince Rupert held Bristol for the King, and was besieged by Parliamentary forces under Sir Thomas Fairfax. The siege began on 4 September when Fairfax sent a trumpeter to the gates of the city to demand its surrender. Rupert replied by asking for time to send a messenger to King Charles in Oxford for instructions. Fairfax refused and the siege went on.¹ Rupert next called for negotiations and presented a list of articles under which he would yield. One of Rupert's conditions would have denied the use of Bristol to Parliament after the Royalists vacated it.² The negotiations went on from 7 September until the 9th when Fairfax realized that Rupert was merely stalling

¹Rushworth, Collections, VI, 73-74.

²Ibid., VI, 75-77.

for time to repair his defenses. The Parliamentarians thus broke off talks on the 9th and launched a heavy attack on the following morning.¹ The attack was successful and Prince Rupert asked for articles of surrender. On 10 September Bristol yielded to Fairfax on terms less liberal than those suggested earlier by the Prince. The entire garrison was permitted to march to Oxford, "with Colours, Pikes, and Drums, Bag and Baggage." Rupert and his officers were allowed their servants, horses and swords. However, all other weapons, including muskets and cannon were to be left behind.² All members of the garrison were guaranteed freedom from plundering and molestation on their march to Oxford.³ These articles, typical of the Civil War period, were faithfully observed by both parties.

After Parliament created the Committee of Both Kingdoms early in 1644, it became increasingly customary for the parent body to vote on articles of surrender referred to them by the army commanders. Parliament tended to demand harsher terms than the military commanders would have granted.⁴ Parliamentary control over the granting of articles of surrender became more apparent in October, 1644 when both Houses passed the ordinance forbidding the granting of quarter to all Irish or Papists born in Ireland. That ordinance, as sent to

¹Ibid., VI, 81.

²With the exception of Rupert's Lifeguard, who were allowed to retain their muskets.

³See Appendix A.

⁴Whitelocke, Memorials, pp. 210-212.

the field commanders, stipulated that such persons would also be excluded from articles of surrender.¹ Thus, when Ludlow's troops took Shrewsbury for Parliament in February, 1644/45, they hanged the Irish members of the garrison.² When Chester fell to Brereton on 3 February 1645/46, the articles of surrender permitted the English defenders to march away unmolested, but the Irish were imprisoned.³ There were instances of violations of articles of surrender, although on the whole, they were rare. When Lord Newcastle's troops captured Gainsborough on articles early in the war, the garrison was disarmed contrary to the agreement.⁴ Many contemporary writers accused Prince Rupert of violations of articles of surrender. When he took Liverpool on articles, he was reputed to have put most of the defenders to the sword.⁵ Parliament's German-born Sydnam Poyntz demonstrated his contempt for articles of surrender by putting to death two hundred defenders of Shelford Manor on 3 November 1645.⁶ When Exeter fell to Parliament on 13 April 1646, Sir John Stowel, although included in the articles of surrender as being permitted to go free,

¹Commons Journals, III, 676.

²Wegwood, King's War, p. 243.

³Rushworth, Collections, VI, 139.

⁴Lucy Hutchinson, Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson (London: J. M. Dent and Co.), p. 127.

⁵Whitelocke, Memorials, p. 87.

⁶Rushworth, Collections, VI, 117.

"was dishonourably and barbarously used."¹

An unusual violation of articles occurred during the surrender of Winchester to Cromwell on 6 October 1645. The articles of surrender stated that all provisions and stores would be left intact for the victors. However, Viscount Ogle, the Royalist commander, was unwilling to leave either wine or beer for the enjoyment of the Parliamentarians. The vanquished Cavaliers consumed the entire stock of spirits, delaying the Parliamentary occupation for some time. One report claimed, "they drank so liberally at their farewell that few of them, as it is their manner, could get up their horses without help." Even Viscount Ogle, the report continued, became, "as drunk as a beggar."²

Generally, Parliamentary troops were made to observe the articles of surrender signed by their commanders. When a group of Cromwell's men plundered some Royalist officers following the fall of Winchester, contrary to the articles, Cromwell apprehended the culprits and had one shot in front of the man's regiment. The others were sent to the Royalist officers who had been robbed. Sir Thomas Glenham, the Royalist commander, returned the men unharmed to Cromwell

¹L. W. Dugdale, A Short View of the Late Troubles in England; Briefly Setting forth, Their Rise, Growth, and Tragical Conclusion As also, some Parallel there of with the Barons-Wars in the time of King Henry III But chiefly with that in France, called the Holy League, in the Reign of Henry I., late Kings of that Realm. To which is added a Perfect Narrative of the Treaty at Uxbridge in an. 1644 (Oxford: Moses Pitt, 1681), p. 207.

²Godwin, Hampshire, p. 340.

with an acknowledgment of his gesture.¹ When Fairfax captured Leicester on 16 June 1645, he ordered his men to observe the articles of surrender, "on pain of death."² In July, 1646, the House of Commons appointed a committee to investigate complaints that Fairfax's men had violated terms of surrender.³

Articles of surrender signed during the Second Civil War tended to be less liberal toward defeated Royalists than they had been in the first war. This condition stemmed from the fact that Parliament had won the first conflict, captured the King and possessed the de facto power in England. They thus regarded their Cavalier opponents as insurgents to be dealt with severely.⁴ The articles of surrender signed at Pembroke Castle on 13 July 1648 demanded that Royalist commander Langharne and his principal officers submit to the mercy of Parliament and the remaining officers, "do depart the Kingdom within Six Weeks for Two Years."⁵

¹Rushworth, Collections, VI, 92.

²Ibid., VI, 50-51.

³Whitelocke, Memorials, p. 223.

⁴Commons Journals, V, 162. An ordinance issued on 4 May 1647 stated, "That all such as been in Arms against the Parliament, are to repair to their own Counties; and that, if they shall be found Straggling in any other County in a warlike manner in their own Counties, then to be punished with Death." Sanderson, Compleat History, p. 1060, reported an ordinance issued in 1648 stating: "That whoever shall engage in a War, Commotion or Insurrection against the Parliament shall dye without Mercy."

⁵Ibid., and Arthur L. Leach, The History of the Civil War (1642-1649) in Pembrokeshire and on its Borders (London: H. F. and G. Witherby, Ltd., 1937), pp. 213-214. Poyer was executed on 25 April 1649.

Prisoners taken in garrisons that fell to an assault generally received poor treatment. Usually the defenders thought themselves lucky to escape with their lives. There were almost always some of the garrison killed as they sought quarter. Usually the ones that were spared were sent to prison. Of the many cases of strongholds taken by storm during the English Civil Wars, Basing House, which fell on 14 October 1645, is a good example. Basing House was the ancestral mansion of the Marquess of Winchester who had fortified and held it for the King. It had withstood two sieges and had long been a thorn in Parliament's side. The final siege began on 8 October 1645, led by Lieutenant-General Cromwell and his New Model Army, heavily supported by artillery. The fighting was intense, with many counterattacks by the garrison.

On 14 October, however, the cannon finally breached the walls and the Roundhead infantry poured through. The scene inside the fortress was one of chaos. Many of the defenders were either Catholic or thought to be, therefore the New Model soldiers granted little quarter. Most of the garrison was slaughtered, including several "officers of quality."¹ The women were treated roughly, and one young girl was killed as she shouted insults at the attackers.² Many of the clergymen inside were also struck down.³ There was a great amount of looting, with everything of value being carted away by the victors. Cromwell sent the survivors, including the wounded Marquess of Winchester to London as prisoners of war.⁴

¹Rushworth, Collections, VI, 93. Whitelocks, Memorials, p. 162.

²Godwin, Hampshire, p. 354.

³Ibid.

CHAPTER II

AFTER CAPTURE

Throughout the entire English Civil War period, Parliament was much better organized than the Royalists to deal with prisoners of war. On 9 January 1642/43, Parliament established a committee, for disposing of such Prisoners as they shall judge dangerous and fit to be removed; And for the manner of Their Restraint; and to what Places they shall be disposed to."¹ This committee, called the "Committee for Prisoners," soon controlled the fate of nearly every Parliamentary prisoner of war, from capture to final disposition. Despite some latitude allowed the commanders in the field, the Committee for Prisoners enabled Parliament to exert far more control over prisoners of war than any authority utilized by the Cavaliers.

The Royalist policies were marked by indifference rather than organization. King Charles appointed his nephew, Prince Rupert of the Palatinate, to assume charge of all military prisoners. A worse choice would have been difficult. The meteoric Rupert was not apt to devote time to the dull job of developing an orderly system for handling prisoners of war. Rupert soon delegated the assignment to subordinates and thought no more of it. The result proved to be a haphazard prisoner of war system that left everything to the field commanders and allowed circumstances to dictate how captured soldiers would be treated.

Generally, a soldier of either party captured during the English

¹Commons Journals, II, 919. The first chairman of the committee was Sir Robert Harley and Mr. Vassat, Mr. Venn, Mr. Purefory, Mr. Cage, Mr. Strode, Mr. Wentworth, Mr. Long and Mr. Heymen, the original members.

Civil Wars could expect to be handled by his captors in any of four ways: release, assimilation into the ranks of his captors, imprisonment, or death.

In many instances, the armies of both sides released captured soldiers. The policy of immediate release of prisoners of war can be divided into two components: unconditional and conditional. Unconditional release meant the freed captive was under no obligation regarding his future conduct. Many of the articles of surrender issued during the Civil Wars contained provisions that bound the victors to unconditional release of their prisoners. When Skippon surrendered Essex's army to the Royalists at Fowey in August, 1644, for example, the articles of surrender permitted the surrendered Parliamentarians to march away to one of their garrisons.¹ Similarly, Oliver Cromwell signed articles for the surrender of Blechington House on 24 April 1645, in which he allowed the defeated Cavaliers to march away.²

Sometimes the captors released their prisoners in an effort to create good will among the local people. Parliamentary commanders often did this when they invaded Royalist districts and faced trained bands comprised of local recruits. Parliament's public image was favorably affected by the release of these prisoners. Sir Thomas Fairfax used this technique to win the affections of the Cornish people. In February, 1645, he gave all Cornish soldiers captured at Dartmouth and Torrington liberty to go home and presented each with two shillings.³ He evidently achieved

¹Rushworth, Collections, V, 705-706

²Ibid., VI, 24.

³Whitelocke, Memorials, pp. 196, 200.

the desired effect, as Lord Hopton could later get no recruits for the King in that region.¹

Parliamentary authorities often released prisoners on conditions of parole. In other words, they forced the prisoner to give his oath never to fight again against the Parliamentary forces. They devised several formal oaths drawn up for this purpose. One of the most common was the acceptance of the Solemn League and Covenant, used after Parliament signed that document with Scotland on 25 September 1643.² The Committee for Prisoners drew up the following oath on 11 April 1643, designed for all prisoners to take prior to release from captivity:

I, A. B. do, in the Presence of Almighty God, promise, vow and protest, that I will never hereafter, upon any Command, Power, or Pretence of Authority whatsoever, take up or bear Arms against any of the Forces under the Command of the Earl of Essex or any other authorized thereunto by Command or Direction of both or either House now assembled in Parliament.³

In many cases, however, the authorities required the prisoners to only swear, "never to beare armes against the Parliament," such as they did after the fall of Scarborough Castle in September, 1648.⁴ By placing released prisoners under parole, Parliament effectively removed them from the service of the King without having to care for them. Violation of parole was very rare. If a prisoner previously paroled was recaptured, he was subject to the death penalty.

Victorious armies of both sides assimilated a great number of

¹Ibid., p. 200.

²Rushworth, Collections, V, 24.

³Commons Journals, III, 38.

⁴Whitelocke, Memorials, p. 333.

prisoners of war into their ranks. They usually invited the prisoners to enlist; however, on rare occasions, they compelled them to become turncoats. When Rupert took Bristol for the King in the mid-summer of 1643, the Cavaliers first promised free quarter to the Parliamentary garrison he, "compelled them to take up arms for the King and wounded and beate them that would not."¹ When Rotherham surrendered to a Royalist force, the victors violated the articles of surrender by forcing the prisoners to join with them.²

In most cases, the captor did not have to employ force to enlist prisoners into his armies. The prisoners preferred life in their captor's army to prison or death, of course, and in some cases, even to release. Release for a soldier hundreds of miles from home meant a long and difficult journey back to his native county, usually without money. Marching to a friendly garrison often meant another losing battle, perhaps ending in death rather than capture. For these reasons, many prisoners flocked to the colors of their former enemies. When King Charles took Banbury Castle on 27 October 1642, the entire garrison immediately went over to his side.³ Similarly, in April, 1643, when Sir William Waller's men took nearly fifteen hundred Welsh Royalists near Gloucester, many of them voluntarily bound themselves by an oath to serve under Waller.⁴

Very likely the common soldiers, especially those who were

¹Lukes Journal, II, 130.

²Margaret Newcastle, The Life of William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle (London: George Routledge and Sons, Ltd., n.d.), p. 79.

³Luke's Journal, I, 56.

⁴Wedgwood, King's War, p. 140.

impressed, did not fight with the same conviction for their cause as did their officers. Thus they were more apt to change sides than were the officers. The instances of officers of either side changing allegiances for reasons of comfort, safety, reward, etc., are extremely rare. Some did, however, change sides out of personal conviction that they had been wrong in their original loyalties. Edmund Ludlow was strongly urged to take the side of the King against Parliament, but he obstinately refused.¹ Captain James Haynes also resisted repeated Royalist entreaties to change sides despite a long imprisonment in Portland Castle.² One officer who did change sides after imprisonment was Sir Joseph Wagstaffe, at first a Lieutenant-Colonel on the Parliamentary side. He was captured by the Cavaliers and afterward agreed to raise a regiment for the King.³ His motives for making the change in allegiance are unknown.

Both parties took the precaution of dispersing turncoat soldiers throughout their forces, rather than concentrating them in one group. Although this practice carried implications of mistrust, there is no evidence that the prisoner-soldiers had any qualms about facing their former comrades-in-arms in combat. The Duke of Newcastle employed several former Roundheads captured in Yorkshire and found they, "proved very faithful and loyal subjects and good soldiers."⁴ In December, 1643, over a hundred Royalist prisoners taken by Sir William Waller's troops at Alton, enlisted in his forces. A few weeks later, they performed very well during

¹Firth, Ludlow, I, 81.

²Bayley, Dorset, p. 229.

³Ibid., p. 140.

⁴Newcastle, Cavendish, p. 21.

Waller's attack on their former comrades in Arundel Castle.¹

Most Civil War prisoners were taken to prison. Parliament's Committee for Prisoners decided which prisoners would be imprisoned, where they would be kept, and how they would be transported. On the Royalist side, these matters were left to the discretion of the field commanders. On 10 January 1642, the House of Commons moved, "That it be left to the Committee yesterday made, to consider of the removing of the Prisoners, to appoint in what manner, and with what Guard, they shall be carried."² Later in the war, Whitelocke noted an order in Commons, "for the prisoners taken by Cromwell and Brown, to be sent up to London."³

Transportation to prison usually involved a long and tiresome journey. For the common soldiers, it meant travel on foot, while the officers and gentlemen, in most cases, rode. All too often, the guards mistreated the common soldiers along the route. Seldom did they so mistreat the officers and gentlemen. Among the many privations endured by prisoners during the Civil Wars, it seems that the trip to their places of confinement was in many ways the worst. On 29 June 1643, Royalist guards drove a column of Parliamentary captives, "with all violence," into Oxford, then allowed the entire group only one pail of water to slake their thirst.⁴ In Hampshire, a Roundhead officer threatened a youth with imprisonment for attempting to pass food to a famished Cavalier

¹ Godwin, Hampshire, pp. 148-149.

² Commons Journals, II, 921. Meaning the Committee for Prisoners, formed the previous day.

³ Whitelocke, Memorials, p. 141.

⁴ Luke's Journal, II, 109.

being marched off to prison.¹

In most cases both Parliamentary and Royalist parties followed a policy of charging the cost of imprisonment to their prisoners. Thus those prisoners with means, "gentlemen of quality," from the upper socio-economic levels, were confined in comfortable surroundings with good food and often attended by their servants. Prisoners from the lower socio-economic classes did not fare as well; usually they were forced to exist on charity or perform manual labor for small amounts of money. The prison conditions under which upper class captives were held were very similar on both sides. For the poorer prisoners, however, there existed a substantial difference in prison conditions. Due to its better organization, the Parliamentary party maintained better prisons than did the Royalists. The Parliamentary Committee for Prisoners functioned to provide adequate prison facilities throughout the Civil War period.² The Royalist prison system suffered from the indifference of the King and its manager, Prince Rupert, thus giving rise to sub-standard living conditions and inhuman treatment of some of its prisoners.

There are many examples of the better treatment given to prisoners from the upper strata of society by both parties. In the ominous Tower of London, used by Parliament to house its important prisoners, the Cavaliers held there were permitted to retain their personal servants.³ In Staffordshire, the Parliamentary county committee granted a large private home to the Provost Marshal, "for the securing of the better sort

¹Godwin, Hampshire, p. 97.

²The Royalists had no similar body in their organization.

³Commons Journals, II, 843.

of his prisoners."¹ The same committee, troubled by the possibility of overcrowding of the "prisoners of quality," ordered that some of the prisoners with servants be moved to a new location in order to make room for incoming captives.² Edmund Ludlow, held for a short time at Oxford by the Cavaliers, reported his treatment to be very civil. He was a prominent Roundhead officer at the time and had a friend in Oxford who was able to help him meet the expense of a comfortable imprisonment.³ Upper-class prisoners who could not pay their bills were held until they could obtain the money. The ensuing order issued by the Committee at Stafford illustrates this point:

It is ordered that Capt. Garland being committed to the custody of Mr. Richard Lee shall not depart from him or be released from his imprisonment till such time as he had payd his Fees and satisfied for his dyet..."⁴

Besides material comforts, upper-class prisoners were allowed certain liberties that made their confinement more tolerable. There are references to unaccompanied walks, visitation permits to local inns and freedom of the town in which they were held.⁵ These upper-class prisoners were "men of honour," and as such, could swear upon their honor not to escape if granted larger measures of liberty than were the common soldiers. The oaths of common prisoners, not men of honor, carried little weight, and it was assumed by prison authorities on both sides that they would

¹D. H. Pennington and I. A. Roots (eds.), The Committee at Stafford 1643-1645 The Order Book of the Staffordshire Committee (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1957), p. 40.

²Ibid., p. 46.

³Firth, Ludlow, I, 78, 87.

⁴Pennington and Roots, Stafford, p. 222.

⁵Ibid., p. 125 and Firth, Ludlow, I, 78.

disappear at the first opportunity if not closely guarded. Therefore, they did not receive the privileges granted to upper-class prisoners. Generally, Parliamentary prisoners were granted privileges upon the approval of the Committee for Prisoners. On the Royalist side, individual officers usually decided the conditions under which their prisoners would be held. The King, of course, could and did intervene in instances when particularly important prisoners were involved.

The Parliamentary prison system was under the direction of the Committee for Prisoners. This committee, established by Parliament early in the war, immediately set out to solve its first problem, that of locating sufficient space in which to house the large number of common prisoners expected to be taken. It was obvious to the members of the Committee that the existing civil prisons in London, filled mostly with debtors, would not bear the influx of a great number of military prisoners.¹ In mid-September, 1642, the Committee ordered that the houses of delinquents be made into prisons.² Later, other private homes, inns and even ships at anchor were designated as prisons.³ The private homes and inns usually held upper-class prisoners, but occasionally common soldiers were kept there. The use of ships at anchor as prisons constituted an emergency measure due in part to the approach of King Charles' army to London during the summer of 1643. The Committee feared an outbreak of violence from the imprisoned Cavaliers if London were be-

¹Margaret James, Social Problems and Policy During the Puritan Revolution 1640-1660 (London: George Routledge and Sons, Inc., Ltd, 1930), p. 329.

²Sanderson, Complete History, p. 578. A "delinquent" was meant to be an active Royalist.

³Godwin, Hampshire, p. 59.

sieged.¹ When Charles had been repulsed and space ashore became available, the prisoners were removed from the ships. Almost all of these captives were common soldiers.²

Other structures utilized as prisons in London included the London Poultry, the Compter on Wood Street and Lambeth House. However, they soon were filled with captured soldiers, so in March 1642/43 the Committee for Prisoners ordered them vacated and their inhabitants distributed among garrisons outside London.³ On rare occasions the Fleet and Newgate civil prisons were used to house common prisoners of war.⁴ The large number of prisoners taken by Parliament at its victory at Naseby in early June, 1645 were held in open fields within London after the officers had been removed to more comfortable quarters.⁵ The condition of the prisoners forced to remain in the open was probably the worst of any Parliamentary captives during the wars. Parliament soon recognized their plight and voted funds for their relief.⁶

Not all of Parliament's prisoners of war were held in London. A substantial number were imprisoned throughout the country in various Parliamentary garrisons. These captives were under the immediate control of the county committees which were responsible to Parliament. In matters concerning prisoners of war the Committee for Prisoners allowed

¹State Papers, Venetian, XXVII, 9-10.

²Commons Journals, III, 229.

³Ibid., II, 1001.

⁴Ibid., 204.

⁵Sanderson, Compleat History, p. 812.

⁶Commons Journals, IV, 217.

a large amount of leeway to the county committees while maintaining overall control. The individual county committee established its local prisons, appointed guards, controlled conditions, allotted prisoners' privileges and fixed the fees charged for accommodations. Parliament's Committee for Prisoners could, however, override an order of a county committee in any of these functions. When the county committee at Lincoln released a group of prisoners without permission of the Committee for Prisoners, for example, the latter ordered an investigation to determine who ordered the release, why, "and of what quality and condition the Prisoners were..."¹ Also, the county committees had to accept or transfer what prisoners the Committee for Prisoners ordered them to. On 26 October 1644 the Committee for Prisoners ordered that the Committee at Stafford deliver Mr. Francis Newport, Sir Gerald Eyeton and Major Manley to Sir Thomas Middleton for conduct to a London prison.²

The county committees followed the general pattern of better treatment for those who could afford it, but it seems that even the common prisoners of war fared better in the county committee prisons than did their comrades held in London. This was probably due to the fact that each county committee had to deal with relatively fewer prisoners of war than did the London prisons. Because of this, there was less cause for neglect and overcrowding. It also proved easier to guard a small number of prisoners in a rural town where escape was difficult, thus the prisoners were not as restricted as those in London. Usually, the county committees allowed the prisoners a large degree of freedom. The Committee

¹Commons Journals, V, 629.

²Pennington and Roots, Stafford, p. 172.

at Stafford allowed its captives to visit close relatives in nearby towns if they posted bond or had someone post it for them. On 15 December 1643 the Committee at Stafford permitted a Mr. Huggeford to visit both his wife in the village of High Onne and his mother in Woverhampton. He was required to post a bond of one hundred pounds return to his place of confinement by December 24.¹ Relatives were also permitted to visit the prisoners. It seems that visits by spouses in privacy were allowed by the Stafford Committee at one time, but that the Committee withdrew the privilege until the Royalist prisons permitted similar liberties. On 1 April 1644 the Order book of the Committee at Stafford carried the following entry:

It is ordered that noe prisoners wife shall have liberty to come to have intercourse with her husband untill such time as the like liberty be allowed to our commanders and souldiers wifes now prisoners with the enemy and in particular the Lady Sarah Houghton.²

Prisoners of war who fell ill were especially well taken care of. This was undoubtedly due as much to the danger of an epidemic as to humanitarian sentiments on the part of the captors. The county committees ordered frequent health inspections of the prison facilities. Prisoners who were seriously ill or crippled were generally released. Others were sent to private homes to recover.³ On 3 January 1643/44 the Committee at Stafford ordered:

Forasmuch as there are so many prisoners in this Garison which are sick and many others of an account, it being a greate charge to maintayne them, and also may much predjudice the

¹Pennington and Roots, Stafford, pp. 15-16.

²Ibid., p. 87.

³Pennington and Roots, Stafford, p. 52.

Gerison by reason of theyr sickness It is therefore ordered that Mr. Turton and Mr. Alicocke be desired to examine and make search what prisoners and Comon souldiers are sick and also to examine what ther be that are poore and weake that they may all forthwith be released.¹

The lack of documentation on the Royalist prison system is regrettable. Most of what exists concerns only one prison: Oxford Castle. The Cavaliers followed the same policy as the Parliamentarians, that of charging their prisoners of war for their accommodations. Like the Parliamentarians, prisoners from the upper classes fared quite well under this system. From all available accounts on the treatment of common prisoners by the Royalists, however, captured Roundheads fared much worse than did their Royalist counterparts held by Parliament. Conditions at Oxford Castle were quite poor. The House of Commons received many letters and petitions from former prisoners of Oxford who had been somehow freed or had escaped. In these documents, the former inmates complained of personal violence, extortion, denial of food and drink, miserable sanitary conditions, insufficient clothing and bedding, and lack of medical attention.² There was such a volume of complaints that Parliament voted on 7 March 1642/43 to form a committee to investigate conditions at the Oxford Castle prison.³ The committee interviewed many former prisoners of Oxford Castle who repeated the complaints described in the letters and petitions. Almost all of those interviewed laid most of the blame for the bad conditions at Oxford on one man, Captain Smith, the King's Provost-Marshal-General at Oxford, who managed the military

¹Ibid., p. 26.

²Frederick John Varley, The Siege at Oxford An Account of Oxford During the Civil War (London: Humphery Milford, 1938), p. 90.

³Ibid.

prison there.¹

Parliament made considerable propaganda capital out of the exposure of the conditions at Oxford Castle. Probably there was more truth than propaganda, however, in the descriptions of the prison given to the Parliamentary committee by the witnesses. Sir Samuel Luke, the Parliamentary Scoutmaster-General, reported several instances of prisoner mistreatment at Oxford in his diaries. The information was obtained by spies for the purpose of military intelligence rather than propaganda. On 21 July 1643 Luke reported, "That the prisoners which came into Oxford on Monday last are sett to digg and worke in the trenches...And yesterday there was a trooper refused to worke, and the Lord Dunsmore caused him to bee beaten and tyed with cords."² Wedgwood mentions that the prisoners at Oxford were forced to drink from puddles on the ground and that they were beaten and ill-used in efforts to persuade them to join the Royalists.³

On 21 March 1642/43 Parliament requested that the Lord General Essex be made aware of the conditions at Oxford and that he in turn attempt to persuade King Charles to insure improvements would be made.⁴ The dismissal of Captain Smith was especially sought. Whitelocke and other members of a Parliamentary commission had previously visited the castle while on a diplomatic mission to Oxford in late 1642. The Royalists had not been cooperative at that time. However, Essex did request the King to investigate the problem and that persons be appointed on both

¹Ibid., p. 91.

²Luke, Journals, II, 108.

³Wedgwood, King's War, p. 189.

⁴Commons Journals, III, 11.

sides to investigate both Parliamentary and Royalist prison conditions.¹ Nothing came of the proposals, but shortly afterwards, the Royalist Oxford Parliament dismissed Captain Smith from his post.² Conditions seem to have improved somewhat as no further complaints were recorded by Parliament.

Fortunately for the memory of Captain Smith, he wrote a letter to King Charles previous to the Parliamentary investigation in which he complained of the circumstances in which he had to carry out his duties. He said that he was not treated with respect by other officers and he was short of funds and men. The guards he did have were careless and inefficient. He had no other officers to assist him and thus had to handle all administrative matters by himself. Finally, he told of having to take care of a number of Prince Maurice's horses during the winter for which he was only partially recompensed.³ Smith's dismissal by the Oxford Parliament was probably an attempt to lay the entire blame for the foul conditions at the Oxford Prison on him. The blame rightfully belonged on Prince Rupert, who had overall responsibility for all matters concerning prisoners of war, or the King himself for failure to act on Smith's letter of complaint. The King, Rupert and other high Royalist officers could hardly offer ignorance as an excuse. It is incredible that they could all live in a city the size of Oxford and not be aware of the suffering of hundreds of prisoners of war confined there.

¹Varley, Siege, pp. 88-89.

²Ibid., p. 90 and Firth, Ludlow, I, 87.

³Varley, Siege, p. 91.

CHAPTER III

RELEASE FROM IMPRISONMENT

The disposition of prisoners of war after their confinement varied widely. In many cases, the socio-economic backgrounds of the prisoners helped determine their treatment. Those who could afford to pay ransom, or who were fortunate enough to have exchanges arranged for them, usually spent little time in prison. The poor and the unknown, namely those who made up the bulk of the Civil War armies, however, were not always as fortunate. If not included in one of the general exchanges, they faced the prospect of imprisonment until death or the end of the wars. A substantial number were parolled or released due to illness. Some were enlisted into regiments formed by Parliament to fight either in Ireland for the Roundheads or in Europe for foreign princes, such as the Venetian Doge. During the Second Civil War, Parliament sent some prisoners, mostly Scots, as slaves to the sugar plantations in the West Indies.

The practice of allowing prisoners of war to secure their release by paying ransom money to their captors stemmed from medieval warfare. This vestige, still used during the English Civil War period, gave the prisoners who could afford it an honorable means of obtaining their freedom and provided a source of income for their captors. Generally, only officers and "gentlemen of quality" could raise the money necessary for their release. The actual sum varied according to the "value" of the prisoner and his ability to pay. On the Parliamentary side, the Committee for Prisoners usually set the amounts for the prisoners held in and around London, leaving a good deal of discretion to the commanders and county committees for other prisoners. Two entries in the Staffordshire

Committee Order Book are illustrative of the wide range of ransom sums. The first, dated 26 February 1643/44, states: "Ordered that Mr. Shakerly shall pay or give security for five hundred pounds hee shall be discharged."¹ The second entry, made a few weeks later, says: That John Whittakers a comon souldier for giving consideration of twenty six shillings eightpence shall be forthwith released."²

Those prisoners who could not raise the full amount of ransom demanded by their captors were permitted to have the balance put up by friends or relatives. Sir Morton Brigs, who raised only five pounds, half the ransom asked by the Committee at Stafford, was released upon a Mr. William Scot's undertaking, "to pay the other five pounds upon Saturday next."³ On 21 May 1643, Sir Samuel Luke accused the King's forces of capturing prisoners, including the Mayor of Salisbury, for the sole purpose of collecting their ransoms.⁴ In 1643, the Royalists held a number of Parliamentary soldiers captive in Wakefield, while demanding ransom money from their relatives in the area. These people, too poor to raise the money, pressed Sir Thomas Fairfax to raid Wakefield to capture Royalist soldiers to exchange for the imprisoned Roundheads.⁵

During the First Civil War, both sides made great use of a system of prisoner exchange. Through this system, each party traded prisoners it held for prisoners of equal value held by the other. Both

¹Pennington and Roots, Stafford, p. 57.

²Ibid., p. 64.

³Ibid., p. 90.

⁴Luke's Journal, I, 80.

⁵Wedgwood, King's War, p. 214.

sides fit their prisoners into a hierarchy of value based on military rank, social station and esteem. Both sides exchanged officers for officers, common soldiers for common soldiers and gentlemen for gentlemen. When Royalist captors exchanged Edmund Ludlow for Sir Hugh Pollard, Ludlow felt that his party had not received the best of the bargain:

"...but I judging this exchange to be very unequal, Sir Hugh being a person much esteemed for his interest and experience, proposed in my letter to the Lord-General, that he would put some other person with me into the balance against him."¹

In 1646, when William Salesbury, a Welsh Parliamentarian, offered to exchange a common soldier for Richard Ball, an officer of his held by Thomas Mytton of the King's party, he was rebuffed in a letter from Mytton: "Ball is an officer, therefore cannot accept the exchange proposed for him."²

Usually, the military commanders of either side, friends, or relatives of the prisoners arranged for the exchanges. They could generally do so entirely by letter in the case of a single prisoner, but usually resorted to negotiations for groups of prisoners. In December, 1643, Colonel Crawford, a defeated Royalist commander, wrote to Sir William Waller, who had worsted him at Alton. Crawford asked for an exchange for his personal physician:

Sir--I hope your gaining of Alton cost you dear. It was your lot to drinke of your own sack, which I never intended to have left you. Pray you favour me so much as to send me my owne chirugion, and upon my honour I will send you a person suitable to his exchange.³

¹Firth, Ludlow's Memoirs, I, 88.

²W. J. Smith (ed.), Calendar of Salusbury Correspondence, 1553-c.1700 (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1954), p. 167.

³Godwin, Hampshire, p. 168.

Later in the war, Waller was forced to call for a general exchange of prisoners after he had been defeated in a series of minor engagements against Lord Goring. He concluded his request for negotiations by saying: "In the mean time, if your Lordship please to release such prisoners as you have of mine, for the like number and quality that I have of yours, I shall esteem it as a great civility..."¹

While Edmund Ludlow was confined by the Royalists at Oxford, he noted two attempts by relatives of prisoners held by Parliament to arrange for his exchange for these men. Lord Arundel sought to have Ludlow exchanged for his two sons, while Lady Byron wanted her husband, held in the Tower of London. Both of these attempts fell through, due to the lack of official approval of the King in the first case and Parliament in the second. Parliament exercised more authority over prisoner exchanges than did the Royalists. In 1645, for example, Commons approval was required for exchanges for Colonel Fielding, a member of Parliament, Colonel Tillier and others.² In exchanges involving only common soldiers, both parties allowed the local commanders a completely free hand.

Some prisoners held by Parliament were paroled from prison. The parole arrangements were very similar to those used to parole prisoners immediately after capture. Usually only the model prisoners were eligible for parole and all had to take an oath that prohibited them from again fighting against their captors. On 21 January 1642/43 Parliament gave

¹Richard Bulstrode, Memoirs and Reflections upon the Reign and Government of King Charles the 1st and King Charles the 1Ind. (London: N. Mist, 1721), p. 120.

²Whitelocke, Memorials, pp. 142, 144, 154.

the Committee for Prisoners authority to decide which prisoners could be released after taking such an oath.¹ Later, the Committee delegated this authority to the county committees throughout England. That the committees exercised this authority is evident in several sources. The Committee at Stafford, for example, freed a London gentleman on 10 January 1643/44.

Forasmuch as Mr. Edward Albaster of London being taken and brought prisoner to Stafford yet upon his engagement he is a gentleman that he will not at any time act against the Parliament It is ordered that he shall be fourthwith enlarged.²

In some cases, the prisoners produced sponsors, often relatives, to guarantee to the Committee that they would live up to the conditions of their parole. The Staffordshire Committee released Rowland Allen after a Sampson Wright and Thomas Allen guaranteed, "upon the penalty of one hundred pounds," that the released prisoner would honor his parole.³ At the end of the First Civil War, Parliament released its prisoners with no apparent restrictions. Nevertheless, the Venetian ambassador noted that, "they make the most carefull note of all who have followed the royal side."⁴

The crowded and unsanitary conditions that prevailed in many of the Civil War prisons made disease a constant hazard for the inmates, especially the common soldiers. The garrisons were also endangered by the threat of epidemics among the prisoners. Because of the danger,

¹Commons Journals, II, 97.

²Pennington and Roots, Stafford, p. 29.

³Ibid., p. 158.

⁴State Papers, Venetian, XXVII, 309.

Parliamentary prison authorities released many sick prisoners. The Committee at Stafford, for example, on 18 January 1643/44, "That 6 sick prisoners be forthwith enlarged."¹ No evidence was found of a similar Royalist policy concerning diseased prisoners of war.

To estimate accurately the number of prisoners that Parliament sent overseas as soldiers or slaves would be virtually impossible. Although most contemporary sources mention instances when Parliament sent its captives to Ireland, Europe or the colonies, they are in conflict as to actual numbers. The chronic state of rebellion in Ireland and the threat of a pro-Royalist Irish force landing in England prompted the Parliamentarians to recruit troops from among their prisoners of war to fight in Ireland. Some Royalist prisoners were quite willing to go because of anti-Catholic feelings. Others not so eager went under duress. In early 1645, Parliament referred to the Committee of Both Houses for Ireland a proposal, "to take care for sending those Prisoners who were willing to fight against the Irish Rebels."² Later in the same year, Parliament referred another proposal to the Committee for Prisoners and the Committee for Irish Affairs in joint session,

To dispose of the Serjeants, Corporals, and Common Soldiers, late sent up Prisoners by Sir Thomas Fairfax, either into the Parliament's Armies, or by transporting such as are fit to be transported either into Ireland, the Low Countries, or with the Lord Irwyn, or otherwise.³

Some of the prisoners sent to Ireland took the Covenant before fighting for Parliament there. A group of Welsh Royalists taken at

¹Pennington and Roots, Stafford, p. 39.

²Whitelocke, Memorials, p. 154.

³Commons Journals, IV, 185.

Colby in August, 1645, for example, went to aid in the defense of Youghal in Ireland after first swearing to the Covenant.¹ Not all of Parliament's prisoners went willingly to Ireland. The Venetian envoy to England reported on 14 September 1645: "To reinforce the armies in those parts (Ireland) Parliament has compelled 600 soldiers who are prisoners of war to preceed to that army, an employment detested by all."²

Besides the prisoners of war sent to fight in Ireland, Parliament also sanctioned the formation of prisoner of war units to serve under foreign rulers, such as Philip IV of Spain and the Venetian Doge. In September, 1645, the Venetian envoy in England reported that Parliament had taken so many prisoners of war, that they had not the facilities to hold them. They had thus, "permitted the Spanish ambassador to raise a levy among them (the prisoners) for service in Flanders, and so far he has got 7 to 800 soldiers."³ The Venetians followed this report with interest, as they had been negotiating for an English regiment to serve against the Turks in Candia for some time. The demands of the Civil War had prevented Parliament from sending a volunteer force, so the Venetians next sought a prisoner-regiment. On 6 October 1648, the Venetian ambassador to France, Michiel Morosini wrote the following to the Doge:

M. de la Valette has been to see me in order to offer 4,000 Scottish prisoners now in the hands of the parliament of London who in ten days he promises to have on board and despatched with the agreement included. I said I was glad to hear it as this enables him to fulfill his original contract. He replied that if the whole of the 4,000 were not taken at one gulp the thing

¹Arthur Leonard Leach, The History of the Civil War (1642-1649) in Pembrokeshire and on its Borders (London: H. F. and G. Witherby, Ltd., 1937), p. 112.

²State Papers, Venetian, XXVII, 213.

³Ibid., XXVII, 311.

would fall apart through of itself, because the English, who are the masters are not disposed to make a grant of 2,000. As I am short of money and in the dark about your Serenity's intention, I have thought it best to gain time.¹

Contemporary English sources indicate that some prisoners were sent to Venice in 1648, but this is not confirmed in the Venetian State Papers.²

Although Parliament did not send any prisoners of war to the West Indies until 1648, it did establish a committee as early as 1642, "to dispose of the prisoners, either by sending them to the Indies or otherwise."³ Parliament did not revive the proposal until early 1648, when two hundred and forty unmarried Welsh prisoners were sent to the Barbadoes.⁴ However, not until Oliver Cromwell's overwhelming victory over the invading Scottish army at Preston on 19 August 1648 did the sending of prisoners of war as slaves to the English sugar plantations in the West Indies become a regular policy. Shortly after the battle of Preston, Parliament established a committee to dispose of the Scottish captives. This committee questioned each prisoner to determine if he had voluntarily joined the Scottish army or had been pressed into it. The committee then permitted those who had been impressed to return to Scotland. Those who had volunteered for the English invasion, however, were sold to English plantation owners in the West Indies and shipped there by English ship owners

¹Ibid., XXVIII, 76.

²E. Robinson, A Discourse of the Civil War in Lancashire (London: Chetham Society, 1864), p. 146. Robinson notes that many prisoners were believed to have been sent to Venice as galley slaves. Whitelocke, Memorials, p. 330, states that many of the prisoners taken by Parliament at Colchester, "were to be transported to America, Venice, or as appointed."

³Godwin, Hampshire, p. 59

⁴Commons Journals, VI, 5.

who had been contracted for the job by Parliament.¹ On 4 September 1648, Parliament referred to the committee for the Scottish prisoners, "that the Gentlemen of Bristol, according to their Desires, may have Liberty to transport five hundred (prisoners), giving the like good Security as others."² Shortly afterwards, a Colonel Montgomery sent two shiploads of Scots to an unknown destination. Very likely, these Scottish prisoners ended up in the Barbadoes, for several years later the citizens of the Barbadoes complained of the political unrest caused by the importation of the Royalist Scots in a letter to Parliament.³

Parliament, by sending its prisoners of war to the West Indies, realized a dual advantage. First, it effectively removed a large number of potentially troublesome individuals from any participation in the military and political affairs of the British Isles. Second, it supplied a cheap and able labor supply to the West Indies, a commodity necessary for the plantation system. As for the prisoners, they did not fare as badly as might be expected. Their terms of servitude were not perpetual. After their sentences had been completed, usually seven years, many stayed on in the colonies and prospered, some well enough to secure indentured servants of their own.⁴

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

³ Abbot Emerson Smith, Colonists in Bondage White Servitude and Convict Labor in America 1607-1776 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1947), p. 153.

⁴Ibid., p. 156.

CHAPTER IV

THE ROYAL PRISONER

On 27 April 1646, the most important prisoner of the war, Charles Stuart, King of England, Scotland and Ireland, rode into a Scottish army camp near Newark and surrendered. The purpose of this chapter is to describe the treatment of King Charles I during his imprisonment by the Scots, Parliament and the Army. No attempt is made to analyze the complex diplomacy carried on by Charles and his captors; this would necessitate a more thorough treatment than space permits.

The King's captivity, lasting from late April 1646 through late January 1648/49, can be divided into five rather distinct periods: the first, his Scottish captivity, lasted from 27 April 1646 until 31 January 1646/47; the second, when Charles was held by Parliament, lasted from 31 January 1646/47 to 4 June 1647; the third, after his abduction by the Army, extended from 4 June 1647 to 11 November 1647; on the latter date, Charles escaped from the Army's confinement and fled to the Isle of Wight, where he was held by Colonel Robert Hammond until 1 December 1648; the last period of captivity began on 1 December 1648, when Charles was taken by the Army and returned to the English mainland, where he remained until 29 January 1648/49.

There is a scarcity of information regarding Charles' treatment by the Scots. From that which is available, it seems that the Scots regarded the captive sovereign as a valuable but unwelcome necessity. Although essential to them in their efforts to establish a Presbyterian settlement in England, he was unwelcome because of their lack of sympathy for him personally or his cause. The Scots took pains to ensure that

the King was treated with respect and in a manner befitting his position. In his letters, Charles mentioned no physical discomfort at the hands of the Scots, although he was harassed in other ways. The Scots displayed no affection for the King nor gave any sign that he was essential to them. The Scottish officers were discouraged from talking with him.¹

The harassment Charles underwent resulted from Scottish attempts to convert him to Presbyterianism. In these attempts, the Scottish leaders, including the Duke of Hamilton, the Earl of Lindsey, the Earl of Craford and the Duke of Cassiles, used all their powers to persuade Charles to sign the Covenant and agree to a Presbyterian settlement. Presbyterian ministers preached to the King at every opportunity. On one such occasion, a Scottish minister in the King's presence called for the singing of the Fifty-Second Psalm, which began with the words: "Why do'st thou Tyrant boast abroad, they wicked words to praise." Charles immediately stood and countered by calling for the Fifty-Sixth Psalm, which opened with, "Have mercy Lord upon me I pray, for men would me devour."²

The King's determination to resist all blandishments to accept the Covenant and an English Presbyterian settlement soon convinced the Scots that his value as a tool against the English Independents had diminished. On 16 December 1646 the Estates of Scotland voted that the King could not be accepted in Scotland, thus cancelling Charles' hopes for refuge there.³

¹State Papers, Venetian, XXVII, 261-262.

²Dugdale, Late Troubles in England, p. 220.

³Wedgwood, King's War, p. 608.

In England, meanwhile, Parliament began making preparations to receive the royal prisoner. They voted that he would be confined at Holdenby or Holmby House in Northamptonshire.¹ One week later, Parliament concluded the treaty with the Covenanters whereby they paid two hundred thousand pounds for possession of the King.² The next evening, Christmas Eve, Charles made his first attempt to escape from confinement. When the attempt failed, he became a close prisoner and the guard around his quarters was doubled. Henceforth he suffered a great loss of privacy, but his physical treatment remained good; he was able to walk about the grounds around his quarters and even play golf while his guards maintained close attendance.³

On 28 January 1646/47, the Covenanters formally told King Charles of their decision to deliver him to the English Parliament.⁴ Two days later, the Scottish army marched out of Newcastle, and Charles was turned over to a group of English Parliamentary commissioners.⁵ On 31 January 1646/57 the latter and their royal captive set out for Holmby. Parliament had earlier voted funds for new coaches and horses to transport Charles and his retinue, thus ensuring His Majesty's physical comfort and regal appearance during the journey.⁶ The King remained a popular

¹J. G. Muddiman, Trial of King Charles the First ("Notable British Trials Series;" Edinburgh and London: William Hodge and Company, Limited, 1928), pp. 25-26.

²Charles Petrie, The Letters Speeches and Proclamations of King Charles I (London: Cassall and Company, Ltd., 1935), p. 212.

³Wedgwood, King's War, p. 609.

⁴Rushworth, Collections, VI, 398.

⁵Wedgwood, King's War, p. 611.

⁶Whitelocke, Memorials, p. 238.

figure among the common people, and if he were mistreated before their eyes, it undoubtedly would have incurred their hostility against the men of Parliament. All along the route the people gathered to watch the procession and cheer their King. Despite the close security of his guards and proclamations forbidding any Royalists to approach the royal person, many people, some unquestionably Royalist, pressed around Charles at every opportunity. Mongo Murray, a former servant to the King, was recognized and arrested after he tried to pass a letter to his old employer.¹ In Leeds, several thousand persons crowded along the road, crying out, "A King! A King!"² At Nottingham, General Fairfax met the royal party, dismounted to kiss the King's hand, and then accompanied Charles for several miles, engaging him in conversation. The incident left the King with a very favorable impression of General Fairfax.³

Only his refusal to hear the two ministers sent by Parliament to administer to his religious needs marred the otherwise tranquil trek to Holmby. The two divines, Joseph Carill and Stephen Marshall, not easily put off, continually sought means to break down the King's obstinacy. On one occasion, Charles did permit Mr. Marshall to say grace at the supper table, and the persistent minister took advantage of the opportunity to deliver a full-scale sermon. The King ate a considerable part of his meal before Marshall completed the blessing and remarked that he, "did not intend to stay until his meat was cold whilst he

¹Sanderson, Compleat History, p. 940.

²Muddiman, Trial, p. 24.

³Whitelocke, Memorials, p. 242, and Sanderson, Compleat History, p. 940

[Marshall] stood whistling for the spirit."¹

Meanwhile, Parliament, perhaps jealous of his evident popularity among the people, passed an ordinance calculated to injure the King's sensitivities. It ordered the beautiful Communion plate from the altar and vestry of Whitehall Chapel to be melted down and made into a dinner service for His Majesty.²

On Tuesday, 16 February 1646/47, the royal prisoner's procession arrived at Holmby.³ The next day Charles drafted a letter to the Speaker of the House of Lords requesting that the ministers assigned to him be replaced. He included a list of twelve divines, any two of whom he would agree to accept.⁴ After seventeen days had passed without an answer, Charles again wrote to the Speaker on the same subject and complained that he had not received a reply.⁵ The Lords finally sent Charles their reply saying that the ministers desired were "disaffected to the established government of the church, and have not taken the Covenant, but for others that have, if his Majesty please they shall be sent to him."⁶

Charles' physical treatment at Holmby was very good. In fact,

¹Muddiman, Trial, p. 23.

²Ibid., p. 24.

³Sanderson, Compleat History, p. 940.

⁴Petrie, Letters, p. 213. The ministers were: The Bishops of London, Salisbury, Peterborough, Doctor Sheldon, Doctor March, Doctor Sanderson, Doctor Bayly, Doctor Haywood, Doctor Beale, Doctor Fuller, Doctor Hammen and Doctor Taylor.

⁵Ibid., pp. 213-214.

⁶Sanderson, Compleat History, p. 943.

it was so good that Parliament sent off a letter to the commissioners complaining of the high cost of the King's maintenance. After that, Charles was forced to pay for his meat and drink out of his own pocket like other prisoners.¹ He had considerable freedom of the grounds at Holmby, and passed the time in conversational walks and bowling.²

On 4 June 1647 Charles' confinement at Holmby came to an abrupt end. Cornet Joyce, a former tailor, possibly acting under Cromwell's orders, rode to Holmby at the head of five hundred mounted troopers and abducted the King from the parliamentary commissioners. When the troop of cavalry appeared at Holmby and Joyce made his intentions clear the King demanded an explanation as to authority for the action, whereupon Joyce replied that the action was by authority of the Army.³

When the troopers set out for Newmarket with Charles, the parliamentary commissioners accompanied them, out of a feeling of responsibility for the King. At Huntington on the evening of 4 June Charles was "nobly treated with much honour and affection, as were the lords and other commissioners."⁴ Meanwhile, General Fairfax, operating on Parliament's orders, dispatched Colonel Whalley to intercept the King and his captors and turn them back towards Holmby. Whalley met the King's party four miles from Cambridge and passed on Fairfax's orders. Charles, however, was unwilling to make the return journey and decided to take up

¹Ibid., p. 940.

²Rushworth, Historical Collections, VI, 516.

³Muddiman, Trial, pp. 28-29.

⁴Kingston, East Anglia, pp. 240-241.

residence at Sir John Cut's house at Childerly.¹ There, he held court and received "doctors, scholars, and graduates of the Cambridge University, whom he allowed to "kneel and kiss his hand."² There he also wrote a letter to Parliament requesting that his children be allowed to visit him.³ Fairfax wrote at the same time, urging them to permit at least a short visit and adding that he would be personally responsible for the safety and return of the King's children.⁴

On 8 June 1647, Charles met with Fairfax, Cromwell, Ireton, Hammond and other officers at the Cut residence. He accused the Army of ordering his removal from Holmby and demanded to know the meaning of the action. The officers denied issuing a commission for the King's removal and summoned Cornet Joyce to explain. The latter admitted to telling Charles he had the Army's commission, but little more came of the hearing. At the conclusion of the meeting, Charles agreed to go with the Army to Newmarket.⁵ The King and his escort set out for Newmarket on 9 June 1647 and again the people enthusiastically received him along his route. In Trumpington his carriage rolled through streets strewn with flowers and boughs while bonfires were lit in his honor.⁶

At Newmarket Charles amused himself by playing tennis and engaging

¹Muddiman, Trial, p. 29.

²Kingston, East Anglia, p. 241.

³Sanderson, Compleat History, pp. 992-994. Charles, Prince of Wales, James, Duke of York and the Princess Elizabeth were in Parliamentary custody at St. James's.

⁴Ibid., p. 995.

⁵Rushworth, Historical Collections, VI, 549-550.

⁶Ibid.

in conversation with his captors. Here he encountered Hugh Peters, the eccentric Army minister, but refused to hear him preach.¹ Soon after this, Parliament ordered Charles taken to Richmond. There had been no action by Parliament on his request for a visit with his children and while he was on his way to Richmond, General Fairfax renewed his request to the Houses in a letter dated 4 July 1647.² Fairfax's second letter brought results, for on 12 July 1647, Parliament granted permission for the children to visit with their father for two days. They were to be accompanied by the Earl of Northampton.³

Charles received favorable treatment at this time. He resided at Lord Craven's house at Caversham, where his chaplains, Dr. Hammond and Dr. Sheldon,⁴ were permitted to attend him. He was granted free access to all persons. Moreover, he was permitted to receive letters from the Queen in France. Parliament's permission for his children to come to him, however, was the greatest favor. Early in the morning of 15 July 1647, the King's children under the guardianship of the Earl of Northampton, left St. James's to rendezvous with their father at Maidenhead.⁵ They arrived there at approximately ten in the morning. The King appeared an hour later. They ate together, then rode to Caversham, where they spent the next two days, and Charles was overjoyed to once again be

¹Ibid., VI, 578.

²Ibid., VI, 610-611.

³Ibid., VI, 612-613.

⁴One of those requested by Charles previously.

⁵Muddiman, Trial, pp. 29-30.

with them.¹

After the pleasant interlude with his children, Charles changed residences several times, finally arriving at Hampton Court on 14 August 1647.² His children were moved to nearby Sion, enabling him to see them more often, and his treatment continued to be generally good. He was able to obtain recreation in the form of pelmel,³ tennis and hunting, the latter by far his favorite.⁴ He took his meals in the presence-chamber with all the formalities of pre-war days. There seemed to be few restrictions on his movements and even those voted as delinquents by Parliament were permitted to visit him.⁵

Nonetheless, there were signs that the King was under considerable strain. His appearance was rather unkempt and his hair had grayed.⁶ Also, ugly rumours reached him with increasing frequency: he was to be locked in the Tower of London; his life was in imminent danger; and many others.⁷ These rumours greatly affected the King. He carefully instructed each of his children as to what they should do in the event of his death, above all stressing the importance of their loyalty to the Prince of Wales.⁸ More important, however, were his own plans

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., p. 30.

³From the French paille maille, the ancestor of croquet.

⁴Muddiman, Trail, pp. 30-31.

⁵Maseres, Tracts, p. 103.

⁶Clarendon, History of the Rebellion, IV, 274-275.

⁷Hynds, Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, XXVIII, 24.

⁸Clarendon, History of the Rebellion, IV, 274-275.

for escape.

On 1 November 1647, Charles withdrew his pledge not to attempt an escape from Colonel Whalley, who immediately doubled the guard around Hampton Court.¹ Despite these precautions, Charles managed to evade his guards and escape from Hampton Court in the evening of 10 November 1647. He was assisted in his escape by John Ashburnham, Sir John Berkely and William Legge, who met him with horses once he had left the grounds of Hampton Court. The four rode all night to Southampton where a ship was supposed to take him across the channel to the Isle of Jersey. When they arrived at first light, the ship was not there. Ashburnham then advised the King to seek refuge on the Isle of Wight.² While Charles and William Legge went to the Lady Southampton's house nearby, Berkely and Ashburnham went across the narrow strait to the Isle of Wight to sound out the Parliamentary governor (and Oliver Cromwell's cousin), Colonel George Hammond. The latter was greatly agitated at the thought of the King coming to the Island, but Ashburnham talked to him at some length, and brought him over to the mainland to the Southampton residence. When Ashburnham reported to Charles, who was in an upstairs room, that he had brought Hammond with him, the King realized he was trapped.³ When Ashburnham offered to go downstairs and kill the Governor, Charles refused and turned himself over to Colonel Hammond. Charles was taken to the Isle of Wight and placed in Carisbrooke Castle, in comfortable

¹Ibid., IV, 286-287

² Whitelocke, Memorials, p. 279 and Muddiman, Trial, pp. 38-39.

³ Clarendon, History of the Rebellion, IV, 290-291.

quarters, "with all demonstration of respect and duty."¹

Meanwhile, the parliamentary commissioners and army guards, waiting for the King to appear for the evening meal, opened his door and correctly surmised that he had fled. They discovered letters on his desk in his hand explaining the reasons for his flight, the foremost being fear for his life.² Parliament, when informed of the King's escape from Hampton Court, issued a proclamation stating that, "it shall be loss of estate and life, for any one to detain the kings person, and not to discover it to both Houses of Parliament."³ A letter from Hammond, however, made it clear that his loyalties were with Parliament: "My endeavors shall be as form my life to secure his person, and humbly desire the pleasure of the Parliament in this weighty matter,..."⁴ Colonel Hammond was caught in an agonizing conflict by the King's arrival on the island. He was bound by loyalty to Parliament and yet felt a responsibility to his King. From his letters, it is clear that he wanted the King kept anywhere but under his guardianship. He repeatedly asked Parliament to move Charles for one reason or another but his requests were unsuccessful.⁵ On 16 November 1647 Parliament voted that, "His Majesty shall continue at the Isle of Wight, and in the Castle."⁶ The Houses went on to order that none who had fought against Parliament, with the exception of

¹Ibid., IV, 291.

²Sanderson, Compleat History, pp. 1016-1017.

³Whitelocke, Memorials, pp. 279-280.

⁴Sanderson, Compleat History, p. 1020.

⁵Ibid., p. 1021.

⁶Ibid., pp. 1020-1021.

natives of the Isle of Wight, would be allowed on the island, and that no foreigner or delinquent would be permitted to visit the King without the consent of the English and Scottish Parliaments. Five thousand pounds were voted for his maintenance, and a new treaty was to be sent to Charles on 22 November 1647.¹

There is not a great deal of information on the King's treatment on the Isle of Wight, but it seemed to be as good as at Hampton Court. Hammond allowed him to take accompanied rides about the island and on good scenting days Charles followed the hounds. On 8 December 1647, a Mr. Hurrey entertained the King at a banquet in his honor at Yarmouth.² All the while the King carried out negotiations with his enemies who daily became more divided. Religion separated Parliament into Independent and Presbyterian parties. The question was largely over church government with the Independents favoring no centralized control and the Presbyterians a rigid, standardized and nationwide form of worship based on the Scottish model. Each side hoped for the King to sign a treaty that would bolster its particular cause. On 26 December 1647 Charles lent his support to the Presbyterians by signing a secret treaty with Scotland while he openly negotiated with commissioners from the English Parliament. This treaty, called the "Engagement," was the primary cause of the Second Civil War. The terms provided for a Scottish army to invade England and place Charles on the throne of a united kingdom. He in turn would implement a Presbyterian religious settlement

¹Ibid.

²Muddiman, Trial, p. 41.

binding for a three year period.¹ Two days later, on 28 December 1647, the King formally rejected the treaty which he had been negotiating with the Parliamentary commissioners since late November.²

As soon as the commissioners returned to London, an incensed Parliament ordered that no further negotiations were to be carried on with the King. Furthermore, the Houses increased the severity of his confinement. They confined him to only two rooms in Carisbrooke Castle, his chaplains removed and his staff of servants reduced to two.³ Colonel Hammond carried out these orders with reluctance in the King's outraged presence.⁴

The Second English Civil War ran its course during the summer of 1648. Royalist uprisings occurred in several places and a Scottish army invaded England under the terms of the Engagement. The Army soon put down the Cavalier uprisings and Cromwell inflicted a decisive defeat upon the Scots at Preston in the late summer. The autumn of 1648 found the Army in control of England, and both the King and Parliament threatened by its predominance. The members of Parliament who feared the awesome power of the Independent-orientated Army took advantage of the fact that many of the pro-Army members were away during the Second Civil War and voted to open talks with the King. These members favored a Presbyterian settlement excluding religious toleration. When the war had ended and the Army returned, its members were motivated by two emotions; fear of a religious settlement without toleration and hatred of the King for his

¹Petrie, Letters, pp. 232-237.

²Muddiman, Trial, p. 42.

³Hynds, Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, XXVIII, 39-40.

⁴Muddiman. Trial. p. 43.

machinations which had brought about the second war. Accordingly, the returning Army leaders immediately moved against their two enemies; King and Parliament.

First, the Army ordered all negotiations between Parliament and the King at Newport to be broken off. On 27 November 1648, Colonel Hammond, who had shown concern for the King's safety, was ordered to surrender his command of Wight and custody of Charles to Colonel Ewer.¹ Two days later, he was arrested on the mainland.² On the evening of 30 November 1648 a strong contingent of Army troops moved onto the Isle of Wight to prevent any last-minute rescue attempt. The next morning at dawn, Colonel Ewer and a Major Rolfe called at the King's bedchamber to take him from the island. They allowed him no time to bid his servants farewell nor to eat breakfast, but jostled him out of the castle and into a coach, which delivered him to dockside.³ They placed him in a boat, took him across the Solent and locked him in Hurst Castle.⁴

The climate at Hurst Castle was undesirable and the surroundings bleak,⁵ but Fairfax ordered that his physical treatment be good. The formalities connected with his position were followed. He was allotted sixteen servants, all chosen by the Army, and he received his meals be-

¹Sanderson, Compleat History, p. 1100.

²Muddiman, Trial, p. 54.

³Wedgwood, Coffin, pp. 32-33.

⁴Sanderson, Compleat History, p. 1100.

⁵Clarendon, History, IV, 509-510. Clarendon states that the air at Hurst was so foul that Charles' guards were regularly rotated, "for the preservation of their health".

neath a canopy from servants who obeyed every rule of courtesy.¹ For exercise, he was permitted to stroll along the narrow shingle beach below the castle walls.²

The King remained at Hurst Castle until 14 December 1648 when he was removed and taken under a strong guard to Windsor Castle.³ Not consulted in advance, he was apprehensive that the move might be an Army plot to murder him. He sounded out the commander of the escort on this and received assurance that this was not the case.⁴ During the trip to Windsor, the people along the route greeted Charles enthusiastically. The journey took several days, necessitating frequent stops. During one such stop, at Winchester, the Mayor and other town officials greeted the King with the traditional respects, dressed in the ceremonial robes of their offices. After the main party had departed, an officer of the guards warned the officials that such displays were treasonable.⁵ Later the entourage rested briefly at Bagshot, the home of Lord Newburgh and Lady Aubigny where there seems to have been a plot for an escape. The vigilance of Charles' guards forestalled these plans, however.⁶

The King arrived at Windsor on 23 December 1648 amidst the tumult of a rioting populace eager to view the captured monarch.⁷ He went to

¹Wedgwood, Coffin, p. 33.

²Muddiman, Trial, p. 54.

³Wedgwood, Coffin, p. 68.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Muddiman, Trial, pp. 59-60., Whitelocke Memorials, p. 358.

⁶Clarendon, History, IV, 523-527.

⁷Muddiman, Trial, pp. 59-60.

Windsor Castle, where he was able to briefly greet another captive, the Duke of Hamilton as the latter was led out, but the King's guards prevented the two from having any sort of conversation.¹

Charles found his treatment at Windsor to be about the same as at Hurst Castle. His attendants were lessened somewhat in number and some formalities were dropped,² but on Christmas Day, 1648, he was able to dine in state dressed in new clothes he had received shortly after his arrival at Windsor.³ After Christmas, however, the Council of War ordered, "that nothing be done upon the knee to the King, and that all ceremonies of state to him be left off, and his attendance to be with fewer, and at less charge."⁴ From this point on, Charles treatment grew steadily worse.

On 27 December 1648 the rump House of Commons moved that the King be placed on trial for his life. Cromwell's remarks at the time were vague. He said that if any man moved on this plan to try the King, he would think him traitorous, but "since Providence and Necessity had cast them upon it; he should pray God to bless their Councils, though he was not provided, on the sudden to give them council."⁵

On Christmas Day, 1648, a committee in the House of Commons began to consider how to try the King and how to draw up a charge against him. By the end of the month, the committee drafted an charge that read that

¹Whitelocke, Memorials, p. 358.

²Dugdale, Short View, p. 366.

³Wedgwood, Coffin, p. 72.

⁴Whitelocke, Memorials, p. 359.

⁵Dugdale, Short View, p. 366.

Charles Stuart had acted contrary to his trust and,

in departing from the Parliament, setting up his standard, making a war against them, and thereby been the occasion of much blood-shed, and misery, to the people whom he was set over for good; that he gave commissions to Irish rebels, and since was the occasion for a second civil war, and had done contrary to the liberties of the subject, and tending to the destruction of the fundamental laws and liberties of this kingdom.¹

The committee also stated that the King would be tried by a special court called the High Court of Justice and composed of about one hundred fifty members under the direction of two Chief Justices. The House of Lords, however, refused to pass the ordinance for trying the King.² To circumvent the action by the House of Lords, Commons simply gave themselves power to enact legislation without approval of the upper House.³

On Sunday, 6 January 1648/49, Commons sent Colonel Miles Corbet to inform the King of the ordinance for his trial. Charles displayed no anxiety when he received the news and said only that no one had the legal right to try him as he was without peer in the country. He further stated that he would not answer the charges and was prepared to die a martyr to his people if need be.⁴

On or about 19 January 1648/49, a troop of soldiers escorted King Charles into London, to St. James's.⁵ Colonel Matthew Tomlinson commanded the guards at St. James's and on the surface he seemed to be a courteous officer. However, the guards at St. James's treated the

¹Whitlocke, Memorials, pp. 359-360.

²Wedgwood, Coffin, p. 101.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Clarendon, History, IV, 531-532.

King with less respect than he had received before. They allowed no one to speak to him, and watched his every move, allowing him no privacy whatsoever. The officers also permitted the men to smoke in the King's presence, a practice Charles, like his father, found abominable. To prevent any chance of the guards sympathizing with the royal prisoner, the officers rotated them regularly, never permitting a man to perform the duty twice.¹

On Saturday, 20 January 1648/49 Colonel Tomlinson took the King from St. James's to Cotton House on the Thames, nearer to Parliament.² Colonel Francis Hacker and Colonel Hercules Huncks then took over responsibility for the King. They were to retain this authority throughout the trial. These two officers saw to it that their charge was denied both privacy and courtesy. The guards under their command were with Charles virtually every minute, both day and night. His sleep during this period of confinement was often disturbed by their noisy and rude behavior, and he was continually offended by their smoking in his presence.³

On the afternoon of 20 January 1648/49 Charles faced the High Court of Justice in Westminster Hall for the first time. During this and the remaining three days of his trial, Charles was subjected to verbal abuse from John Bradshawe, the Lord President of the Court, as well as from the guards on duty during the proceedings. They, prompted by their officers, shouted, "Justice! Justice!"⁴ as the King entered in an attempt

¹Ibid., IV, 532.

²Wedgwood, Coffin, pp. 137-138.

³Ibid.

⁴Dugdale, Short View, p. 370.

to unnerve him. After each day at Westminster, Charles returned to his quarters and further harassment from his guards there. At one point, he refused to undress or go to bed unless the soldiers left his bedroom.¹

On Saturday, 27 January 1648/49, the Army brought the trial to an abrupt end when it became clear that the King was gaining, rather than losing popularity. He was brought before the Lord President to hear his sentence pronounced:

For all which treasons and crimes, this court doth adjudge, that the said Charles Stuart as a Tyrant, traytor, murtherer and publick enemy, shall be put to death, by the severing of his head from his body.²

The guards hurried the King out of Westminster to Whitehall without allowing him to speak after sentence. At first it appeared that his treatment was to be less considerate than at Cotten House. Two soldiers were to sleep in the same room as the condemned ruler until the date of the execution.³ However, the Colonels Hacker and Huncks were replaced by Colonel Tomlinson and Colonel Thomas Herbert. Both of these officers were loyal to the Army but conducted themselves with tact and regard in their contact with the King. They did all that was possible to ease his burden, such as granting small favors and even running errands for him. One of Tomlinson's first orders was for the removal of the guards from the King's bedroom.⁴

In the late afternoon of Sunday, 28 January 1648/49, Charles'

¹Wedgwood, Coffin, p. 153.

²Sanderson, Compleat History, p. 1128.

³Williamson, Day, p. 55.

⁴Ibid.

guards moved him from Whitehall to St. James's, probably to spare him the sight of his gallows being constructed. Tomlinson, in overall command of the guards there, ensured that the men treated the King with respect.¹ That evening, Colonel Herbert took a small ring to a woman in Westminster for Charles. She gave him a small box to return to the King. In it was a collection of jewelry to be passed on to the King's children.² The name of the woman remains a mystery.

On Monday morning, 29 January 1648/49 the King's children³ came to visit their father with the permission of the Army. The visit was brief and emotional and the strain on Charles' composure was evident. He told them not to worry about him as he was going to a "glorious death" and that he had already forgiven his enemies. He reminded Henry of his loyalty to his eldest brother and that under no circumstances was he to permit himself to be proclaimed King while the Prince of Wales still lived. To this the young Henry replied, "I will be torn in pieces first!" which greatly pleased the King.⁴ After the children left, Charles spent the rest of Monday in prayer and meditation with the kindly Bishop Juxon. After Juxon's departure, the King read and prayed until midnight, when he finally retired to a sound sleep.⁵

The execution of King Charles I took place on Tuesday, 30

¹Wedgwood, Coffin, p. 192.

²Williamson, Day, p. 49.

³Princess Elizabeth, aged thirteen, and Henry, Duke of Gloucester, aged ten.

⁴Williamson, Day, pp. 50-52.

⁵Wedgwood, Coffin, p. 207.

January 1648/49 on a scaffold erected immediately behind the Banqueting House at Whitehall. Charles had risen early that day and taken Communion from Bishop Juxon before being marched from St. James's to Whitehall. He arrived there at about ten in the morning and was kept waiting until mid-afternoon while Cromwell overcame some last minute wavering among those who were to sign the death-warrant.¹ When finally the King stood on the scaffold, he saw to his disappointment that he would be unable to address the crowd of Londoners gathered below due to the fact that the guards kept them at too great a distance. He therefore addressed his last words only to those on the platform. He restated his innocence of the illegal charge brought against him and his conviction that he was to die a martyr for his people. After a reminder from Bishop Juxon he reaffirmed his belief in the tenants of the Church of England. At approximately three-thirty in the afternoon, the executioner's axe fell and the troubled reign of King Charles I was at an end.²

Charles became a prisoner at a time when his enemy stood divided. During his entire period of captivity he constantly sought to further the divisions by any way he could. There were many who had fought against him out of the conviction that England's troubles were the fault of the King's ministers rather than Charles himself. They originally bore no ill will toward the King's person nor the institution of the monarchy. There were men of this mind in all of the factions on Parliament's side. While each party sought to win the King to its point of view, those who trusted Charles saw that he was well treated in all

¹Williamson, Day, pp. 121-125.

²Wedgwood, Coffin, pp. 213-223.

reasonable ways. When, however, the King's perfidy was revealed by the fateful Scottish Engagement of 1647, great was the disappointment of those who had trusted Charles. After this, his treatment worsened and all of the distrust and anger formerly directed at the King's advisors now was focused on the King himself. The more radical elements represented in the Army gained ascendancy and it was during this period that the Army leaders decided that Charles Stuart must die if a lasting peace was to be attained. The method of a trial gave a facade of legality to the disposal of the King, necessary for reasons of state and to placate the urban and rural masses who still regarded the King as a popular figure and the monarchy as sacred.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

A comparison of the Parliamentary and Royalist prisoner of war systems revealed that the former was far superior in terms of providing better care for its captives. The Parliamentarians were not more humanitarian than the Cavaliers, but their talent for organization and administration permitted them to provide better treatment. Parliament established a committee with sufficient authority to oversee all functions of the prisoner of war system, from surrender terms to provisions for release. Armed with this authority, the Committee for Prisoners first set up prisons at various places to prevent overcrowding, and subsequently organized transportation, arranged for visits to the prisons by physicians, approved exchanges and ransoms and carried out many other related activities. The Committee for Prisoners exerted a centralized control over practically every facet of the prisoner of war system. When the task became increasingly difficult, the Committee shared some of its responsibility with local officials, such as town mayors and county committees. The Committee always maintained overall control, however. Because the Committee for Prisoners was more efficient and able to plan intelligently, the prisoners under its control seldom went without adequate food, shelter, clothing or medical care.

The Royalists, on the other hand, lacked a system for the treatment of prisoners. King Charles' appointment of his nephew, Prince Rupert, as the man responsible for prisoners of war was a mistake. Rupert resented anything that kept him from the center of action. There

was little glory to be found in planning for the proper safekeeping of captured rebels. Rupert thus retained the authority over prisoners of war but did nothing with it, nor did he delegate the responsibility to anyone else. Because of Rupert's lack of interest, the Royalist prisoner of war "system" lacked any centralized control or planning. The military commanders in the field usually did what they pleased with prisoners of war. Transportation was disorganized, food and water generally unavailable, and there was little attempt to disperse the prisoners. Most went to the crowded Oxford prison. In prison, the captives found insufficient shelter, food, and medical care.

Most of the prisoners taken during the English Civil Wars were captured after negotiations for surrender. Many were released or paroled. Parliament's officers had to obtain approval from Parliament and the Committee for Prisoners for surrender terms offered to all important Cavalier forces. If the members of Parliament or the Committee considered the terms too lenient, they could instruct the officers to reject them. One unfortunate example of Parliament's control over surrender terms was the 1644 Parliamentary ordinance prohibiting the granting of quarter to Irish soldiers in the King's service. The Irish revolt in 1641 during which many Protestant settlers in Ireland were horribly murdered, the fear of a Catholic conquest of England, and Charles' negotiations with the Irish rebels greatly increased English fear and hatred of anything Irish. The 1644 ordinance was mainly the result of this fear, although Parliament may have hoped to deter Irish troops from fighting on the King's side by such drastic means. Actually, the number of Irish soldiers in the Cavalier ranks was never large and the number

of them killed under the terms of the 1644 ordinance was correspondingly small. Probably the total number did not exceed two hundred.

On the Royalist side, the terms for surrender of enemy forces was left to the discretion of the local commander.

Prisoners who were not released or paroled had to be transported to a place of confinement. The Parliamentary Committee for Prisoners gave the Army commanders orders as to where their prisoners were to go and how they would be transported. Usually the means of transportation was by foot for those who were able. The journey to prison was often the most arduous period of a prisoner's captivity. The Committee was careful to spread out the places where the prisoners were sent so that overcrowding and food shortages would not result.

Royalist provisions for transportation of prisoners was haphazard. The Cavalier officers forced the prisoners to travel to their place of captivity as best they could, usually with meagre supplies of food and water. As the Royalist officers had no idea of the conditions of the prisons they sent their captives to, they made little attempt to disperse them. Most were sent to Oxford prison, which became badly overcrowded.

Both the Royalist and Parliamentary forces utilized the policy of charging the cost of upkeep to their prisoners. This benefited the prisoners from the upper classes as they could afford to pay for comfortable lodgings, good food and other advantages. The common prisoners seldom had any money. They had to work for their captors, usually for low wages, to pay for their needs. Parliament's Committee for Prisoners saw to it that at least the basic necessities were available for the

prisoners who worked for them as well as those, who because of illness or wounds, could not. The Royalist prisons were not governed in this manner and common prisoners often were forced to work to pay for cramped, cold quarters and food that was not available.

The greatest enemy of all prisoners of war during this period was disease. The Committee for Prisoners took precautions in the Parliamentary prisons by having periodic inspections. Prisoners who were found to be ill were usually removed, either to be released or sent away to convalesce. Besides being motivated by some humanitarian sentiments, the members of the Committee realized that an epidemic starting among prisoners of war could easily spread to the garrison with disastrous results. No evidence was uncovered regarding the Royalist policy toward sick prisoners. So far as is known, no such policy existed.

The Committee for Prisoners had overall control over the release of all prisoners of war, although in cases involving small numbers of common prisoners, this control was generally waived in favor of the local officials. Proposed prisoner exchanges of officers or large numbers of common prisoners had to be cleared by the Committee. Ransom payments also required the Committee's approval. The amounts were never rigid, but varied according to the socio-economic-military value of the individual prisoner. The Committee set the standards for parole, including the oath to fight no more against Parliament required of all prisoners to be paroled. Parliament "released" some prisoners to a harsher fate than simple imprisonment. These were the Welsh and Scottish prisoners of war who were sent to the Barbados as slaves on the English sugar plantations. Although most of these prisoners were freed after

seven years, and many prospered in the Caribbean, it is likely that most never again saw their homes and families. It was a cruel and unjust policy, but was continued by Cromwell during his later campaigns in Scotland and Ireland.

The Royalist policy toward release of prisoners allowed almost complete discretion to the military commanders. King Charles could, however, set certain special conditions for the exchange, ransom, or other means of release or particularly important prisoners.

With the exception of the treatment of Irish, Welsh and Scottish prisoners Parliament's prisoners of war were considerably better off than those of the Cavaliers. It was fortunate that Parliament did not adopt a harsh and repressive policy toward all of its prisoners of war. Such a policy would have made the scars of war more difficult to heal, leaving a weakened England to face her European adversaries.

The Royalist failure to establish an efficient prisoner of war system reflected both apathy and poor administration. Had Charles appointed an able person or persons whose sole responsibility was the management of prisoners of war with enough authority to carry out this responsibility, surely the Royalist prisoners of war would have received better treatment. As it was, Parliament was to garner a considerable amount of propaganda from the disclosure of the Oxford prison conditions, which greatly embarrassed Charles. His plea of ignorance cannot be accepted when it is recalled that he lived in Oxford a great amount of the time that the prison was there. The Royalist prisoner of war system was cruel to its inmates because of its inefficiency rather than as a matter of policy. It served as an example of the superiority of Parlia-

ment's organized committee system of attacking problems over the King's use of court favorites for important tasks.

King Charles was less a prisoner of war than a hostage. Each of the various factions within the Parliamentary camp that held him hoped to attract him to their particular views. While trying to win him over, they were willing to treat him with respect if not affection and maintain at least the facade of royalty. Charles' popularity with the urban and rural masses was also a factor in his good treatment. Only when his complicity with the Scots was revealed did his captors begin to harshen his treatment. From the time of his removal from the Isle of Wight to his execution, his captors gradually increased the pressure on the King while steadily demeaning his position by lessening his servants, restricting his freedom and doing away with the ceremonies associated with his rank. The only physical mistreatment Charles received was the axe blow that ended his life. His captors were very cautious about their handling of the King, due in part to their fear of evoking popular sympathy among the common English people. Charles' death was the result of the realization by his captors that the danger he presented as a conspirator, as demonstrated by his signing of the Scottish Engagement. The device of a public trial and execution served to give Charles' death a facade of legality. This placated to an extent both the English masses and foreign powers whose good relations were vital to the new English government.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

ARTICLES OF SURRENDER FOR BRISTOL, 8 SEPTEMBER 1645¹

Articles of Agreement for the Surrender of the City of Bristol with the Castle and Forts thereof, between his Highness Prince Rupert, and his Excellency Sir. Tho. Fairfax, made Sept. 8, 1645.

1. That his Highness Prince Rupert, and all Noblemen, Commanders, Officers, Gentlemen and Soldiers, and all other Persons whatsoever now resident in the City of Bristol, and the Castle and Forts thereof, shall have free liberty to march away out of the said City, Castle and Forts, with their Arms, Flying Colours, Drums Beating, Trumpets Sounding, Pistols Cockt, Swords Drawn, Matches Lighted, Bullet in their Mouths; every Foot-Soldier his Bandeliers full of Powder, with Match proportionable; and every Horseman his Flask full of Powder, with all the Bag and Baggage, Horses and Furniture, four pieces of Ordnance, twenty Barrels of Powder, Match and Bullet proportionable.
2. That none of the Persons aforementioned, or of their Retinues shall be searched, molested or troubled upon what pretence so ever.
3. That none of the Parliament Army whatsoever shall entice, or perswade any Officer or Soldier belonging to Prince Rupert, from their Regiments or Colours with any promise of Preferment or Reward.
4. That all such Officers and Soldiers that are hurt or sick, and cannot now march out of the City, Castle, and Forts, shall have liberty to stay until they be recovered, and then have safe Conduct to go wheresoever they please, either to any of his Majesty's Armies, or Garisons, or their own Houses, there they may live quiet, and that in the interim they shall be protected by Sir Tho. Fairfax, and have civil usage.
5. That all Prisoners taken on both Sides since the beginning of this Siege, be forthwith set at liberty.
6. That the Persons abovementioned, that are to march away shall have a sufficient Convoy to any of the King's Armies or Garisons, which the Prince shall name, not exceeding fifty miles from Bristol, to secure them in their March from all injuries and incivilities that shall or may be offered to them, for which March they shall have eight days allowed from their marching out of Bristol, and Free Quarter by the way during the same space, and shall have Carriage-Horses, and Wains with Teams provided sufficient for Carriages of all forts from Quarter to Quarter, they giving caution forthwith to return the same immediately.

¹Rushworth, Collections I, 78-80.

7. That none of the Persons above mentioned shall be in their said March, Rendezvous or Quarters, Searched or Plundered upon any pretence whatsoever; and that two Officers shall be appointed by Sir Thomas Fairfax, the one for accomodation of Quarters for them by the way, the other for providing of Horses and Carriages for the Baggage and Train.

8. That all the Citizens of Bristol, resident within the City, Suburbs, and Liberties thereof, and all Noblemen, Gentlemen, Clergy-men, and others resident within the same, that have not otherwise been engaged in Arms, or hostility against the Parliament then in defence of the said City, Castle, or Forts, shall freely enjoy the liberty of their Persons, and also of their Houses, Lands, Goods and Estates at their own disposal, according to the known and Enacted Laws of the Land (they continuing from henceforth either in the said City, or elsewhere under the obedience and protection of the Parliament) and this Article to extend to those of them whose Estates are Sequestred, as well as those that are not Sequestred, and that they may quietly rest at their Abodes, or travel freely and safely upon their occasions, and for their removal of their Goods, shall have such liberty, as is hereafter provided in the Fifteenth Article.

9. That all or any of the Persons above mentioned, who shall desire to go beyond the Seas upon their private occasions, and shall give assurance from henceforth not to bear Arms, or act any thing against the Parliament, or to the prejudice of their Affairs, shall have liberty to pass to any place beyond the Seas any time within three Months.

10. That no Garrison, save the Citizens themselves, shall without their consent be put into the City, except in the Castle and Forts, and what force shall be placed therein, shall be maintained at the charge of the State.

11. That no Churches be defaced, that the several Members of the Foundation of the Cathedral in Bristol, shall quietly enjoy their Houses belonging to their Places, and for the Revenues of them, as also the Ministers of the City for their Benefices, they shall be in the same state and condition with other Clergy-men of their quality continuing in the protection and obedience of the Parliament.

12. That no Oaths other than such as are required by the Enacted Laws of the Land shall be imposed upon any Person, that now is, and shall continue in the said City, Suburbs, and Liberties, either by the General, or any other by his Authority.

13. That the Mayor, Sheriffs, Aldermen, and Citizens within the Corporation of the City of Bristol shall be free in their Persons and Estates, and enjoy all their Privildges, Liberties, and Immunities in as full and ample manner as formerly before the beginning of this War, and shall have freedom of Trade by Land and Sea to all Places, and with all Persons not in hostility against the Parliament, paying such Duties and Customs to the Officers appointed by the Parliament, as formerly they have done to his Majesty; and that no Mulct or Fine be imposed on any

Person mentioned in this Article, nor any of them questioned upon pretence of any act or thing done or committed before the date hereof, the King's Forces marching forth as aforesaid, and that no free Quarters shall be put upon them without their own consents.

14. That all other Persons whose Dwellings are in this City, and now absent, shall have the full benefit of these Articles as if they were present, provided that such of them as are elsewhere in Arms against the Parliament, do come in within one Month after the date hereof.

15. That all Noblemen, Gentlemen, and others who have Goods in the said City, and are now present or absent, shall have liberty at any time within one Month to dispose of their said Goods as they please, except it be Arms or Ammunition.

16. That there shall be no Plundering admitted under what pretence soever, nor any taking away of any Man's Person, or any part of his Estate contrary to these Articles, and that Justice according to the known Laws of this Land be administred to all Persons within this City by the Civil Magistrates.

17. That in consideration hereof, the City of Bristol, with the Castle, and all the Forts and Fortifications thereof, without any slighting or defacing thereof, and all the Ordnance, Arms, Ammunition, and other Furniture and Provisions of War therein, without diminution or imbezlement (excepting what is allowed to be carried as before) shall be delivered up to Sir Tho. Fairfax on Tuesday Morning next by Nine of the Clock, at which time the Prince with all the Persons mentioned in the first Article that march out, then naming what Army or Garison of the King's he will march unto.

18. That none of them in their marching out, or before, shall Plunder, hurt, or spoil the Town, or any Person in it, nor carry out any thing but what is properly their own (except before excepted.)

19. That the Convoy, and two Officers to be sent with the Prince (as before) in the Sixth and Seventh Articles, shall not have any violence offered or done to them by any of the King's Forces during the said Eight Days allowed for the Prince his March, and Seven Days more for their return to the Army.

20. That sufficient Hostages shall be delivered immediately upon Signing hereof for performance of those Articles on both parts.

APPENDIX B

ARTICLES OF SURRENDER, LORD RALPH HOPTON TO

SIR THOMAS FAIRFAX, TRURO, 14 MARCH 1645¹

Articles of Agreement concluded betwixt Commissary General Ireton, Colonel John Lambert, Colonel John St. Aubin, Commissary General Stane, Captain Edward Herle, and Richard Deane Comptroller of the Ordinance; Commissioners appointed on the Behalf of his Excellency Sr. Thomas Fairfax Knight, General of the Parliaments Army, on the one Part; and Colonel Charles Goring, Colonel Marcus Trevor, Colonel Thomas Panton, Colonel Jordan Bovill, Sr. Richard Prideaux Knight, and Mayor Goteer; Commissioners appointed on the Behalf of the Right Honourable the Lord Hopton, General of his Majesties Army, on the other Part; as followeth:

I. It is concluded and agreed, that no Person in the Lord Hopton's Army, not formerly by Name Excepted by the Parliament from Pardon, shall be excluded from the Priviledge of this Treaty; either as being a Foreigner, or for having formerly served the Parliament; but shall equally have the Benefit of what shall, upon this Treaty, be granted to other Persons of that Quality that they are of in the Army: And for any Persons by Name Excepted by the Parliament, they shall have present Liberty (if they desire it) to go beyond Seas, with like Recommendation and Equipage as other of like Quality: Or if they desire to live at home in England, to make their Addresses to the Parliament, for that, or other purpose, they shall have leave and reasonable Time so to do, and the General's Protection to live quietly and at Liberty, in any Place they shall nominate and chuse within the Parliament's Quarters, until they have received the Parliament's Resolution; and if the Parliament shall not think fit to grant such their Desires, they shall then have Leave and Passes to go beyond the Sea, as before; or to any of the King's Armies or Garrisons, as they shall think fit.

II. That the Army and Forces under the Command of the Lord Hopton shall, within Six days after the date herof, be wholly disbanded and discharged, by the Lord Hopton, and the General Officers, Colonels and other Officers under his Command; according to the several charges in manner hereafter expressed.

III. That all Common Troopers, Corporals of Horse, Farriers and Sadlers, that are mounted, being of, or belonging to the Forces under the Command of the Right Honourable the Lord Hopton, shall bring in and deliver up their Horses with their Bridles and Saddles, and all their Arms unto his Excellency Sr. Thomas Fairfax, or unto whom he shall appoint to

¹Rushworth, Collections, I, 110-115.

receive them in Manner, Time, and Place, as is hereafter expressed: provided that all Corporals, and such Common Troopers as shall appear Gentlemen of worth, and such other Troopers as shall go beyond Sea, shall be allowed to keep and carry away with them their Swords.

IV. That upon Performance hereof they shall receive Twenty Shillings a Man or keep their Horses; and shall have their Passes to go to their homes in England, or beyond Sea, with their Bag and Baggage, which they shall have leave to carry with them or dispose of them as they please; and those to whom Swords are allowed, as before, to pass with their Swords.

V. That the Commission Officers of Horse under the Lord Hopton, for their several Troops respectively, shall cause the said Horses and Arms to be duly delivered in without Changes, Spoiling, or Embezzlement among themselves, according to the effect of the First Article before going.

VI. That this being performed, all the said Commission Officers of Horse in present command, and all Trumpeters belonging to them, shall have liberty to go away, either to their own Homes in England, or beyond the Seas, with their Bag and Baggage. And also they shall have such number of Horses and Equipage, as is hereafter allowed, according to their several qualities: That is to say,

First, For those that shall chuse to go beyond the Seas, the full number of Horses and Fire-Arms, if they have so many of their own.

To Trumpeters one Horse apiece, and their Trumpets.

To Quarter-Masters two Horses, and one Case of Pistols.

To Cornets three Horses, and two Case of Pistols.

To Lieutenants Four Horses, and three Case of Pistols.

To Captains, Majors and Lieutenant Colonels six Horses, and four Case of Pistols.

To Colonels Eight Horses, and six Case of Pistols.

To the Adjutant General six Horses and four Case of Pistols.

To the other Adjutants of Brigades, three Horses apiece, and one Case of Pistols.

To the Scout-Master General six Horses, and two Case of Pistols.

To the Quarter-Master General six Horses, and two Case of Pistols.

To the Marshal-General four Horses, and one Case of Pistols.

To the Deputy Quarter-Master General two Horses.

To the Deputy Scout-Master one Horse.

To the Major General twelve Horses, and six Case of Pistols.

To the Commissary-General of Horse-Provisions, three Horses and a Case of Pistols.

To the Commissary-General of Victuals three Horses, and one Case of Pistols.

To the Chirurgeon-General three Horses.

To Quarter-Masters of Brigades three Horses, and one Case of Pistols.

To Chirurgeons of Regiments, two Horses.

To all these, except Chirurgeons their defensive Arms, and Swords for themselves and their Servants, and to every Field-Officer one Carabine, and Chirurgeons their Swords.

Secondly, Those that shall chuse to abide in England with the General Sir Thomas Fairfax his Protection, and to live at home, shall have their Proportions as followeth:

To Trumpeters one Horse apiece, and their Trumpets.
 To Quarter-masters one Horse apiece.
 To Coronet's and Lieutenants two Horses apiece, and one Case of Pistols.
 To Majors four Horses apiece, and one Case of Pistols.
 To Lieutenant Colonels five Horses apiece, and one Case of Pistols.
 To Colonels six Horses apiece, and two Cases of Pistols.
 To the Major General ten Horses, and three Case of Pistols.
 To the Adjutant General six Horses, one Case of Pistols.
 To the Adjutant of Brigades one Horse apiece, and one Case of Pistols.
 To the Quarter-Master General six Horses, one Case of Pistols.
 To the Marshal-General three Horses, one Case of Pistols.
 To the Deputy Quarter-Master General two Horses.
 To the Scout Master General four Horses, one Case of Pistols.

All these to have Swords for themselves and their Servants.

To the Commissary of Horse-Provision, two Horses and a Case of Pistols.
 To the Commissary of Victuals, two Horses, a Case of Pistols.
 To the Deputy-Scout Master one Horse.
 To the Quarter-Master of Brigades, two Horses.
 To the Chirurgeon-General, two Horses.
 To Chirurgeons of Regiments, one Horse.
 To Chaplains, two Horses.

All these, except Chaplains to have Swords for themselves and their Servants.

VII. That the precedent Articles concerning the Surrender of Troopers Horses, and being performed, if any Officer in Command that chuseth to live at home, shall appear to have more Horses of his own than what he is before allowed by the last precedent Article, the Commissioners of Sir Thomas Fairfax his part, will recommend it to his Excellency's favour, that they may enjoy the benefit of such Horses of their own, to the same number as Officers of like quality that are to go beyond the Seas.

VIII. That of the Reformado Officers that chuse to live at home in England, Reformado Quarter-Masters shall have the same Conditions as Corporals in Command; Cornets and Lieutenants shall go away with one Horse apiece. Captains, Majors and Lieutenant, Colonels with two Horses apiece, and Colonels with three Horses apiece; if they have so many of their own, and one Case of Pistols. Those Reformadoes that desire to go

beyond Seas, to have half the proportion of Horses and Arms allowed in that Case to Officers of like quality in present Command, if they have them of their own, all of them to go with Swords, Bag and Baggage or dispose thereof at pleasure.

IX. That all Gentlemen of Quality in Arms, or not in Arms, but living under the protection of the said Arm, shall have liberty either to go to their own Houses, or beyond the Seas, with Bag and Baggage, and Equipage, according to their several qualities, as followeth:

That is to say, a Knight with four Horses, three Servants, one Case of Pistols, and their Swords.

An Esquire with three Horses, two Servants, one Case of Pistols, and their Swords.

A gentleman with Two Horses, one Servant, one Case of Pistols and their Swords.

A gentleman of lowest Rank with one Horse for himself, and a Sword.

Scholars and Clergy-men to have one Horse at the least, or more, according to their different degrees, at the General's discretion.

X. That to all those who according to the effect of the Articles shall chuse to go beyond the Seas, Passes shall be granted from the General Sir Thomas Fairfax accordingly; and to those who being English shall chuse to live at home, Passes for that purpose, and Proections for the liberty of their Persons, and also for the Freedom of their Estates from all Plunder and violence of Soldiers; and that such Gentlemen, or others that have considerable Estates, may have the General's letter of Recommendation to the Parliament (if desired) for their moderate composition.

XI. That after the performance of these Articles so far as to Disbanding and delivering up of what is to be delivered, all Officers and Soldiers that shall according to these Articles, chuse to go beyond the Seas, shall have sufficient Quarters assigned them by Sir Tho. Fairfax near convenient Ports for their Transportation: And that they shall have Twenty eight Days allowed to stay in England, from the day of their several Disbanding, and that the charge of Quartering their Horses be discharged by themselves after the first fourteen days for the time of their further stay. That the General will appoint Men to take care that Shipping shall be provided for Transporting their Persons, Arms, Bag and Baggage, they paying the accustomed Rates.

XII. That a certain number of Officers of the Lord Hopton's Army not exceeding forty, upon the Lord Hopton's Commissioners request, shall be permitted to have Passes for themselves, and their Servants, Horses and necessaries to go to Oxford; Provided, that their Servants exceed not the number of two, their Horses three, to every one respectively.

XIII. That the Lord Hopton shall be allowed for his own use, all his Horses: Provided they exceed not the number of forty; and Arms for himself and twelve Men. And that the Lord Wentworth shall have all his Horses: Provided they exceed not five and twenty, and Arms for himself

and Eight Men, and Places assigned them for conveniency of Quarters.

XIV. That such English Men as shall chuse to abide in England at their Homes, and all Foreigners of the said Army shall engage themselves by Promise, in such Form as is herewith agreed on; Not to bear Arms any more against the Parliament of England; nor to Act anything wilfully prejudicial to the Parliament's Affairs, without first rendring themselves Prisoners to the Parliament: And likewise all such English as shall chuse to go beyond Sea, shall engage themselves in the like Promise for Three Years next ensuing the Date hereof, or to otherwise shall lose the Benefit of these Articles; Excepting the Lord Hopton and the Lord Wentworth, and the Number of Officers allowed to go to Oxford in the Twelfth Article before going who are by the Intention of these Articles left free from such Engagement.

XV. That all Horses, Arms and Furniture of War, belonging to, or in the hands of any Person in the said Army, not allowed in the precedent or subsequent Articles to be carried away, shall be delivered up to such Persons and such Places near Truro, or Sr. Thomas Fairfax his Head Quarters, as his Excellency shall appoint, within Six Days after the Date hereof without Spoil or Embezzilment, as the Care as well of the General Officers of the said Army and all Commanders in their several Charges, as by the Persons themselves to whom such Arms or Furniture of War do belong, or in whose Custody they were.

XVI. That whosoever shall after the Conclusion of this Treaty, purposely break, spoil, or embezzle any of the Arms, Horses, or Furniture agreed and concluded to be delivered up in this Treaty, shall forfeit the Benefit due to him by an Article in the Treaty. And if any of the said Army, after the Conclusion of this Treaty, shall Plunder or wilfully do any Violence unto any Inhabitants of the Country, he shall give Satisfaction unto the Persons so wronged, or lose the Benefit of the Treaty; and that the Commissioners of both Parties, or any Three of them, whereof one or more to be of Sr. Thomas Fairfax his Party, and one or more to be of the Lord Hopton's shall have Power to hear and determine all such Cases accordingly.

XVIII. That for the Disbanding of the said Forces, and Delivering up of Horses, Arms, etc., in Performance of the precedent Articles, every Brigade and Regiment under the Lord Hopton's Command shall by their Respective Commanders be drawn out into such Places of Rendevouz, within Two Miles of Truro, or Sr. Thomas Fairfax his Head Quarters, and upon such Days as Sir Thomas Fairfax shall for them jointly or severally appoint, notice of the same being given to his Excellency in writing Sixteen Hours before-hand, under the Commissioners of the Lord Hopton's Part, or any of them; Two or more of whom shall for that End and other Purposes, continue at Sr. Thomas Fairfax his Head Quarters, until the disbanding be finished; and that the Quarter-Master General, or Adjutant of the Lord Hopton's, with one Horseman from every Brigade, shall also be there with them, and that none of the said Brigades or Regiments shall be drawn out of their Quarters (which shall be assigned to them as before) otherwise than upon, and according to, such notice from Sir Thomas

Fairfax as before, except to and for their ordinary Guards.

XIX. That to, or before the drawing out of the several Brigades or Regiments to such Rendezvouz, as before, the Chief Commanders of them respectively shall deliver, unto whom Sir Thomas Fairfax shall appoint, a true and perfect List of the Regiments and Troops in the several Brigades, and of all Officers and Soldiers in their several Troops, expressing by Name which of them do chuse to go beyond Sea, and which do go to live at home, as also who are Reformadoes, and in what degree of Command they have served: and that, at the same Time and Places, the Horses, Arms and Furniture, by vertue of the Precedent Articles, to be delivered up accordingly; and all the Officers and Soldiers disbanded, and discharged, and there shall receive their Passes, with Warrants for Quarters by the way for one Night in a place, and be conveyed towards their several Homes, as far as Chard, if they go so far, or unto Quarters assigned them for their Transportation, according to the precedent Articles.

That for a further performance of these Articles, two Colonels of each Army shall be mutually delivered and kept as Hostages.

H. Ireton.	Edward Herle.	Thomas Panton.
Jo. Lambert.	Richard Deane.	Jordan Bovill.
Jo. St. Aubin.	Charles Goring.	Richard Prideaux.
William Stone.	Marcus Trevor.	Jean Goteer.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

Davies, Godfrey. Bibliography of British History, 1603-1714. Oxford 1928.

BOOKS

Aiken, Lucy. Memoirs of the Court of King Charles I. 2 vol. London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, Green, and Longman, 1833.

Ashton, John. The Fleet Its River, Prison, and Marriages. New York: Scribner and Welford, 1888.

Bayley, A. R. The Great Civil War in Dorset. Taunton: Barnicott and Pearce, The Wessex Press, 1910.

Blundell, Margaret. (ed.), Cavalier Letters of William Blundell to His Friends 1620-1698. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1933.

Brett, S. Reed. The Stuart Century 1603-1714. London: George G. Harrap and Co., 1961.

Bulstrode, Richard. Memoirs and Reflections upon the Reign and Government of King Charles the Ist. and King Charles the IInd. London: N. Mist, 1721.

Bund, J. W. Willis. The Civil War in Worcestershire 1642-1646 and the Scotch Invasion of 1651. London: Simpking, Marshall, Hamilton and Company, Ltd., 1905.

Burne, Alfred H. and Young, Peter. The Great Civil War A Military History of the First Civil War, 1642-1646. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1959.

Carlyle, Thomas. (ed.) Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.

Clarendon, Lord Edward. (Edward Hyde) History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1849.

Clark, Andrew (ed.) The Life and Times of Anthony Wood, Antiquary of Oxford, 1623-1695, Described by Himself. 5 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1891.

Clark, George Norman. War and Society in the 17th Century. Cambridge: University Press, 1958.

- Dick, Oliver Lawson. (ed) Aubrey's Brief Lives. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1957.
- Dugdale, L. W. A Short View of the Late Troubles in England; Briefly Setting Forth, Their Rise, Growth, and Tragical Conclusion As also, some Parallel thereof with the Barons-Wars in the time of King Henry III. But Chiefly with that in France, called the Holy League, in the Reign of Henry III. and Henry IV. late Kings of that Realm. To which is added A Perfect Narrative of the Treaty at Uxbridge in an. 1644. Oxford: Moses Pitt, 1681.
- Ekstein, Harry. Internal War: Problems and Approaches. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.
- Ellis, Henry. Original Letters Illustrative of English History. London: Richard Bentley, n.d.
- Firth, Charles H. and Rait, R. S. (eds.) Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1911.
- Firth, Charles H. Cromwell's Army. 3rd ed. London: Methuen and Co., 1962.
- Gardiner, Samuel R. History of England. 10 vol. London: Longman Green and Co., 1884.
- Gardiner, Samuel R. History of the Great Civil War. 4 vol. London: Longmans Green and Co., 1910.
- Godwin, G. N. The Civil War in Hampshire (1642-1645) And The Story of Basing House. Southampton: Henry March Gilbert and Son, 1904.
- Granville, R. The King's General in the West. Life of Sir Richard Granville. London: 1870.
- Hallam, Henry. The Constitutional History of England From the Accession of Henry VII to the Death of George II. 3 vol. London: John Murray, 1829.
- Hill, Christopher, (ed.) The English Revolution 1640 Three Essays. 4th ed. London: Lawrence and Wishart Ltd., 1949.
- Hutchinson, Lucy. Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson. London: J. M. Dent and Co., n.d.
- James, Margaret. Social Problems and Policy During the Puritan Revolution 1640-1660. London: George Routledge and Sons, Inc., 1930.

- Jones, I. Deane. The English Revolution 1603-1714. London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1931.
- Kingston, Alfred. East Anglia and the Great Civil War. London: Elliot Stock, 1897.
- Leach, Arthur Leonard. The History of the Civil War (1642-1649) in Pembrokeshire and on its Borders. London: H. F. and G. Witherby, Ltd., 1937.
- Ludlow, Edmund. The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow Lieutenant-General of the Horse in the Army of the Commonwealth. 1625-1672. (edited by Charles H. Firth) 2 vol. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894.
- Luke, Samuel. Journal of Sir Samuel Luke. 3 vol. Oxford: The Oxfordshire Record Society, Banbury, Cheney and Sons, 1894.
- Mackie, J. D. Cavalier and Puritan. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., n.d.
- Maseres, Francis (ed.) Select Tracts Relating to the Civil Wars in England in the Reign of King Charles the First; By Writers Who Lived in the Time of Those Wars, and Were Witnesses to the Events Which They Describe. London: R. Wilks, 1815.
- Mitchell, William A. Outline of the Worlds Military History. Harrisburg: Military Service Publishing Co., 1931.
- Montross, Lynn. War Through the Ages. New York and London: Harper and Bros., 1946.
- Muddiman, J. G. Trial of King Charles the First. Edinburgh and London: William Hodge and Company, Ltd., 1928.
- Murdock, Kenneth Ballard. The Sun at Noon Three Biographical Sketches. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1939.
- Newcastle, Margaret (Margaret Cavendish). The Life of William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle (edited by Charles H. Firth). 2nd ed. London: George Routledge and Sons, Ltd., n.d.
- Osgood, Robert Endicott. Limited War. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Pennington, D. H. and Roots, I. A. (eds.) The Committee at Stafford 1643-1645 The Order Book of the Staffordshire Committee. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1947.
- Reckitt, Basil. Charles the First and Hull. London: A. Brown and Sons, Ltd., 1952.

- Robinson, E. A Discourse of the Civil War in Lancashire. London: Chetham Society, 1864.
- Ropp, Theodore. War in the Modern World. Durham: Duke University Press, 1959.
- Rushworth, John. Historical Collections of Private Passages of State. 6 vol. London: Chitwell and Cockerill, 1701.
- Sanderson, William. A Compleat History of the Life and Raigne of King Charles from His Cradle to His Grave. London: Humphrey Mosely, Richard Tomlins and George Sawbridge, 1658.
- Smith, Abbot Emerson. Colonists in Bondage White Servitude and Convict Labor in America 1607-1776. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1947.
- Smith, W. J. (ed.) Calendar of Salusbury Correspondence 1553-circa 1700 Principally from the Lleweli, Rug and Bagot Collections in the National Library of Wales. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1954.
- Smith, W. J. (ed.) Herbert Correspondence The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Letters of the Herberts of Chirbury, Powis Castle and Dolguog, Formerly at Powis Castle in Montgomeryshire. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1963.
- Thurloe, John. A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe, Esq; Secretary, First to the Council of State, and afterwards to the Two Protectors, Oliver and Richard Cromwell. London: Thomas Woodward and Charles Davis, 1741.
- Varley, Frederick John. The Siege of Oxford An Account of Oxford during the Civil War, 1642-1646. London: Humphery Milford, 1932.
- Veale, F. J. P. Advance to Barbarism. Appleton: C. C. Nelson Publishing Co., 1953.
- Verney, Frances P. and Verney, Margaret M. Memoirs of the Verney Family During the Seventeenth Century. 2 vol. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1925.
- Warwick, Phillip. Memoires of the Reigne of King Charles I with a Continuation to the Happy Restauration of King Charles II. London: Richard Chitewell, 1701.
- Wedgwood, C. V. A Coffin For King Charles. The Trial and Execution of Charles I. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1964.
- Wedgwood, C. V. The King's Peace 1637-1641. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1956.

Wedgwood, C. V. The King's War. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1959.

Whitelocke, Bulstrode. Memorials of the English Affairs or, an Historical Account of what passed from the beginning of the Reign of Charles the First, to Charles the Second His Happy Restauration. Containing the Publick Transactions, Civil and Military Together with the Private Consultations and Secrets of the Cabinet. London: Nathaniel Ponder, 1682.

Wright, Quincy. A Study of War. 2 vol. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942.

Younghusband, George. The Tower From Within. 2nd ed. New York: George H. Doran Co., 1919.

NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS

A Perfect Diurnall of Some Passages in Parliament. (London),
25 March 1644-31 March 1645, 30 March 1646-22 March 1647.

Butler, James D. "British Convicts Shipped To American Colonies,"
American Historical Review, II, No. 1 (October, 1896),
pp. 12-33.

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS

Great Britain. Journals of the House of Commons. vols. II-V.

Great Britain. Journals of the House of Lords. vols. II-IV.

Hynds, Allen B. (ed.) Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice and in other Libraries of Northern Italy. vols. XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII. London: His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1925.